THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXVI, NO. 2 FEBRUARY, 1957

CONTENTS

The Witness of Hungary .... *Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani* 73

The First Marian Shrine in the United States
Marion A. Habig, O.F.M. 81

St. Francis de Sales, Patron of Writers
Edward J. Carney, O.S.F.S. 90

Theology for the Undergrad .... *Thomas Dubay, S.M.* 95

Catholics in Colonial America. Part II..... *John Tracy Ellis* 100

The Councils of Baltimore and the Catholic Press
Joseph Clifford Fenton 120

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Our Lady's Vow of Virginity 132

Missa pro Populo and Religious Superiors 133

Religious Profession and the Remission of
Temporal Punishment 133

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1957 by the Catholic University of America Press

(Contents Continued from Preceding Page)

Authority of the Church over the Unbaptized 134
The Administration of the Sacraments to a Dying Schismatic 135
Multiplicity of Stipends on Easter Sunday 136

ANALECTA

Review of Recent Roman Documents
Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm. 137

BOOK REVIEWS

Beyond the Dreams of Avarice, *by Russell Kirk* 139
Catholic Pioneers in West Africa, *by Martin J. Bane, S.M.A.* 141
This Mysterious Human Nature, *by James M. Gillis, C.S.P.* 142
The Great Prayer, *by Hugh Ross Williamson* 143

Modern Chalice

To achieve a modern effect in a manner both decorative and dignified, was the aim of Gorham designers in creating this new Chalice. Although not apparent from this small illustration, the detail is very beautifully executed in the finest traditions of Gorham craftsmanship. This Chalice is of sterling silver, priced at $260. gold plated all over, or $235. gold plated inside — both prices include Paten and Case.

Prices subject to change without notice.

Gorham
PROVIDENCE 7, RHODE ISLAND
AMERICA'S LEADING SILVERSMITHS SINCE 1831

THE WITNESS OF HUNGARY[1]

I

Brethren, let us adore Jesus Christ, who is present behind the eucharistic veil. The more humble and hidden we see Him, the greater and more powerful our faith in Him. Let us adore the just God, supreme Judge of the living and the dead.

"The more we are troubled by the iniquity that triumphs in this world, the more we see men violating every divine and human law and with unspeakable ferocity, tearing apart individuals, families and nations, the more faithful we wish to be to Him who is the one, sure, infallible restorer of natural and supernatural moral values, the one, sure, just, strong and paternal Judge who will give to each his just due."

Certainly the discomfort, the anguish of the present moment is great, so great as to be a tremendous apocalyptic misfortune about which we ought to weep, rather than speak.

Jerusalem under the invaders did not give Jeremias as great a motive for mourning as Hungary has given us. All the words of the prophet recur to our lips, all his prayers and deprecations are appropriately matched by today's so terrible, so enormous, misfortune and desolation.

But is there yet no justice in this world?

Lord, Lord, here on earth men proclaim themselves saviors of justice and peace, but they make neither peace nor justice. There is such license, O Lord, to do evil, that "superbia eorum qui te oderunt, ascendit semper!" (*Psalm* 73:23.)

In that body which ought to be the supreme assembly of world justice the aggressor sits as a judge among the other judges, and as representatives of the victim there sit those who are accomplices of the assassin.

---

[1] This is the text of a sermon delivered by Cardinal Ottaviani at the Holy Hour for Hungary and for Peace, held by order of the Holy Father in St. Peter's Basilica in Rome the afternoon of Sunday, Nov. 25, 1956. The Italian original was published in the following day's issue of *L'Osservatore Romano*. The translation is that of Fr. James J. Markham of The Catholic University of America.

Is not the rest of the world in some measure responsible, since it has demonstrated, with calculating cynicism, an impotence and prudence that allow the allies and servants of the butchers to be insolent in the face of public indignation and to exalt the murderers? The responsible world is meek only in appearance. Is it acting at the level of moral excellence of those who are dying because they stand up for their faith and refuse to betray the freedom of the sons of God?

O mighty men of the world, listen! Listen to the tremendous warning of the Holy Spirit: "The Almighty will examine your works and scrutinize your thoughts. For . . . you have not governed properly, you have not observed the law of justice, nor have you walked according to the will of God. Swiftly and terribly He will fall upon you, and rigorous justice will be done upon those in high places. For the little ones there will be mercy, but the powerful will be powerfully punished. The Lord of all will not withdraw before anyone. The great and the small He has created, and He cares equally for all."

O Jesus, supreme Judge of the living and the dead, what hope and what comfort is given to the faith by these words of the Holy Spirit! Yes, we believe in You, God, Son of God, constituted by the heavenly Father as Judge of centuries past and to come, who will give to each his due. "Mihi vindictam, et ego retribuam." The restoration of balance between crime and penalty, goodness and reward, will take place not only for each man on the day of his passing, but also for all men together on the tremendous day of judgment, *Dies irae, dies illa.*

O Jesus, who are now hidden and silent, You Yourself have described how You will come in Your majesty to judge.

"Then the sign of the Son of Man (Your cross, O Lord) will be seen in heaven; all the tribes of the land will mourn and they will see the Son of Man coming upon the clouds of heaven, with great power and glory. And He will send out His angels with a loud blast of the trumpet, to gather His elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other."

Lord Jesus, Supreme Judge, give eternal peace and rest to the souls of the heroic Hungarians torn apart by the fierce followers of antichrist, and bring it about on the supreme day of judgment that they return triumphant with all those who, in the course of the centuries, have merited or will merit that happiness which You reserved for the persecuted. "Beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter iustitiam, quoniam ipsorum est regnum coelorum" (*Matt.* 5:10). Blessed are those who suffer for justice, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven!

II

Gratias agamus . . .

Vere dignum . . . nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere.

In grief as in joy, in earthly life as in celestial, in the grief that purifies and in the pure and holy joy that lifts us on high we thank You, O Lord, for the wisdom and power with which You draw good from evil.

Has He not allowed us, by our grief and with our blood, "adimplere ea quae desunt passionum eius?" Does He not give the Church the grace of rejoicing through the glory of her martyrs? What great glory for the ideals of the word "Christian" is in the persecutions undergone by the Hungarians! How their blood, with that of Abel, "clamat," invokes, admonishes, illumines the minds of a great number of those in error who are now rethinking their beliefs and are forming a judgment on communism.

We must also thank You for the light and the strength with which You have endowed Your vicar on earth, who has proclaimed before all the world the principles of truth and justice by which the aggressors must be condemned and liberty and peace be returned to the oppressed. We thank the Lord, who, amidst such darkness and such vileness and calculated aloofness, has made light to shine and selflessness and courage, too, in those who have spoken in the name of God and have given expressions of condemnation which will resound through history to the perpetual shame of the aggressors and to the glory of the Church, a vindication of sacred and human rights of the redeemed and Christ-liberated mankind.

Let us thank the Lord for this true greatness shown by the head of His Church, which is in brilliant contrast to the few small demonstrations, under these grievous circumstances, by those who are called great by the world.

O Jesus, You who are not content even with the cross, and who have given Yourself by the sacrament of Your love and Your sacrifice and by Your grief, O Jesus, who, in the hour of Your great pain and shortly before Your death, have provided a way for us to have You in our grief as well as in our joy—always mysteriously, but really present, and present at our request as food that restores the soul and as an irrefutable pledge of love and resurrection; O Jesus, our justice and our mercy, give thanks for us to the Heavenly Father for all that He has given us, for His past and present benevolence and for all He has done and is doing.

Thank Him for having given You and in You every treasure of grace and the spiritual life. You are the eucharist, that is to say, a thanksgiving, our act of thanks to the Father, our holocaust, our point of contact where the descending God meets ascending man. O Jesus, You are our way and our wings. You are our food and our rest. What would earth be, O Jesus, if You had not descended as a man and had not remained sacramentally!

Now especially we are undergoing trial; now we have a refuge in You during such anguish. Now the refugees, the deported, the orphans and the widows of desolated Hungary have more than a human aid in You, a most effective comfort, a companion in exile, a friend, a sustainer of hope, a refuge in supreme grief.

We thank You, O Jesus, for the comfort that You are giving to the common father of the faithful, who sees such competition in generosity and help among his sons for the aid of their Hungarian brothers, such a unanimity of prayer, such solidarity in love.

III

Parce Domine, parce populo tuo.

The most barbarous destruction, the most methodical ferocity, the most maniacal and macabre cruelty is massacring a people and the rest of men wash their hands of it and are glad to be free of it.

Brethren, let us tremble. The people of Hungary are dying on the cross with Jesus for us, too. This nation is teaching the rest of the world, making it understand what horrible things fall under the bloody torches of communism. Woe to us if after such a clear and frightening testimony given in blood we still continue to be wicked and sinful!

We have not committed sin, yet we sin. We sin by omission. If there is anyone homeless, anyone without food or fire, even anyone without work, whose fault is it? Whose sin is it? If there is anyone among us who does not know God or who denies or blasphemes Him, whose fault is it if not ours, since we do not know how to reveal Him by our actions and defend Him with our lives? If impurity smolders in homes and is shown even on the walls of the city, whose fault is it? If the world has become pagan or ignores God or fights Him, who is to blame if not we?

And are we not also sinners, perhaps, in deed as well? Who would dare be surprised at the wrath of God and His justice if he thinks of such sins? My dear children, we must render strict account to ourselves, for not one of our faults—not even the smallest one—will fail to reap its just due. With that said, let us reflect with fear how many sins are committed, and let us shudder. Let us reflect, each one in the silence of his soul, on our own sins. Let us reflect even on a single sin. It is enough to frighten us. Who is there who, finding himself face to face with a lion, would dare to provoke it? Who is there who would make a careless move on the edge of a cliff? And yet we unfortunates are all in the hands of God and we offend Him, we do not cease to offend Him.

He has loved us and we repay Him with ingratitude. He has given us life and we, as soon as He became man, killed Him. He has showered all sorts of gifts upon us and we have thrown them into the mire. He maintains life in us by a continual miracle and we hardly think of His existence. He is all and does all and we are nothing and do nothing for Him.

How can divine justice spare us? Let us look within. Sin reigns everywhere, even among us who recognize and confess His Holy Name.

O Jesus, we know it and we confess it aloud. Your Father would not be God if He were not just, and His justice knows neither limits nor obstacles! It is infinite and omnipotent. His justice has given an example memorable for its severity in Your passion and death. If in You, the green wood, the fire of His wrath is so inflamed, what will happen in us, the dry wood, good only to be thrown into eternal fire?

Lord Jesus, behold us at Your feet. Yes, we are Your *populus acquisitionis*. We are those redeemed by Your blood. We are Your adopted brothers. We are your witnesses and your adorers. We are your people and also we have left You, betrayed You, denied

You, perhaps even blasphemed You. Lord Jesus, we are Your people, and we are sinners. Have pity upon us.

IV

Fiat misericordia super nos.

The Hungarian people are mounting the cross of Christ today and they are making reparation for our faults. Yes, ours, and to our shame.

A story is told that when Clovis heard about Jesus' Passion for the first time he could not help but exclaim "Why wasn't I there with my Franks?"

My dear children, today's men, by contrast, are happy that they are not there where for Christian ideals of liberty and for fidelity to the principles of morality and the faith the followers of Christ are taking up the cross and a whole people is crushed by the myrmidons of antichrist. Yes, literally crushed in their cities and in the countryside, in the present, and, yes, in the time to come.

Nothing is left but to appeal to the mercy of God.

The mercy of God will save that generous people which saved Christian civilization so many times with its blood. The mercy of God holds His wrath at a distance and saves the peace of the world. It gives exiles a safe return, dries the tears of so many mothers, hears the pleading cries of so many orphans.

God is not less merciful than just, and to tell the truth, here in this world His mercy appears to be rather greater than His justice. As Creator He is all goodness, He is every gift, all largess, and all heart (if I may be permitted so to speak). What can be said of Him as a Father? What as a redeemer? What is to be said of Him as Paraclete and consoler?

God is great and great is His mercy. What are the heavens, what is the earth—if not a gift from Him? What is the visage of man and what is his soul if not an image of Him. What is more beautiful in the world than the mercy of God? What is greater, more vast, more intimate?

If God's justice reaches everywhere, then His mercy—though it may be slow—will certainly arrive, and in a certain way His presence continues always. He is always just, but His justice appears in a special manner when He punishes. His mercy, on the other hand, always appears, even when He punishes. He is resplendent in the smiles of the just, He triumphs in the tears of the sinner. In time of joy He is bright as a happy day, in pain He burns clearly as the key and the meaning of a secret. If the cross of Jesus is the emblem of divine justice, it is also the emblem of divine mercy. On that cross a God punishes our sins and a God expiates our sins. Justice goes hand in hand with mercy.

Hence, amidst so much sadness, we can have hope.

Your sadness will be turned into joy (*John* 16:20) as Jesus said as His passion drew near and a profound grief entered the hearts of His disciples at the thought of what He would suffer as He was about to start on the way of the cross and separate Himself from His friends. So they will scourge you, they will throw you into prison, they will kill you.

Do not fear; I have conquered the world. Thus, Jesus, we must hope. Heaven and earth will pass away, but not what You have said. "Verba mea non transibunt." My words shall not pass away (*Mark* 13:31).

O Lord, we do have this faith and this trust. But You will not consider it a lack of confidence in You if we pray to You with the ancient cry of the prophet, for Your hour is soon coming, the hour of our joy, for the hour of Your mercy is at hand. "Cito anticipent nos misericordiae tuae."

It is true, O Lord, that You called the apostles "men of little faith" when, terrorized by the storm, they awoke You with their suppliant cry of anguish, "Lord, save us, we perish." You, O Lord, hastened the moment of calm by commanding the winds and the waves.

Is there not a creature, Your Mother, the Immaculate Virgin, who taught us that you can hasten Your divine intervention? "Nondum venit hora mea," You said. Nevertheless the omnipotent Will yielded to the power that You Yourself gave to prayer and obediently and immediately produced a miracle.

Jesus, Lord of our souls, have pity on the dying, the suffering and those who are heroically casting away their lives for the glory of Your name. Make great this wonderful people whom Your enemies wish to overwhelm. We are all Hungarians today, or at least we would wish to be so in Your sight. They are about to represent us as You represented us on the cross. They are our testimony and our witness. We give You thanks that amidst such vileness You have given us a people so great, so courageous, in a word, so Christian. If such greatness be possible again Your death was not in vain, and our hopes will become certainties. We do not despair when we see how they face Your enemies and fight to liberate the Church from the oppressing and scourging antichrists, and how they die for Your love and Your glory, O Jesus.

ALFREDO CARDINAL OTTAVIANI

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for February, 1907, entitled "Vox cleri," and contributed by Fr. W. H. Cologan, of Stock, England, suggests that the rank and file of the clergy be invited by the hierarchy to express their views on important matters affecting the diocese. He says: "If the clergy of a diocese had opportunity for debate on subjects closely affecting themselves personally or the diocese generally, it would probably tend to the advantage of the clergy and of the diocese generally." . . . Fr. J. F. Boyd, of Plymouth, England, gives an account of the recent Church-State relations in France. He informs us that in December, 1906, the French government seized 50,000 churches and also all parish and episcopal residences, seminaries and church lands, in addition to invested property valued at sixteen million pounds sterling, expelling bishops and priests from their homes without a franc of assured stipend. . . . A writer signing himself "A Layman" discusses "The Principle of Almsdeeds" and calls for greater generosity on the part of the faithful toward the work of the missions. . . . Fr. H. Heuser, the editor, writes an interesting description of a book that was published in the seventeenth century in Frankfort, Germany, on Christian symbols. The author give his name as Philotheus, but was actually Count Carolus Ludivicus. . . . Fr. W. L. Moore, O.P., of Woodchester, England, writing on "The Riddle of Life," points out the shallowness of monism, especially as expounded by Häckel. . . . The Analecta section contains the important decree of the Congregation of the Council giving a concession from the eucharistic fast (permitting liquids) for those laid up for a month or more —twice a week for those dwelling in institutions where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, twice a month for others. . . . In the Literary Chat we read an account of an election recently conducted in France on the relative pre-eminence of great Frenchmen of the nineteenth century. Fifteen million votes were cast. Louis Pasteur was the winner, with Victor Hugo in second place.

F.J.C.

THE FIRST MARIAN SHRINE IN THE UNITED STATES

Half a league, or one and one-fourth miles, north of the old fortified town of Saint Augustine, Florida, there was in 1728 an Indian mission town called Nombre de Dios, with a stone church (at least by 1726) which was dedicated to San Francisco. Of the forty-four mission centers which were founded in Spanish Florida, Nombre de Dios was the first; and to the end of the Spanish period, it was the only mission that was constructed of stone. All the others were built of wood, or of poles and palm.

The stone church at Nombre de Dios was not only a mission church. It was also a Shrine of Our Lady, the first Marian Shrine in what is now the United States. It had become the Shrine of Nuestra Señora de la Leche a century earlier, when a little statue of Our Nursing Mother of Happy Delivery (Nuestra Señora de la Leche y Buen Parto) was placed in that church some time between 1602 and 1620.

In 1728 a raiding party of English from Georgia and their Indian allies, under the command of Colonel Palmer, appeared before the gates of Saint Augustine. Unable to take the town, they attacked and burned the nearby Indian village of Nombre de Dios, and robbed its church and friary, carrying off everything of value, including priestly vestments, sacred vessels, and votive offerings at Our Lady's Shrine. Many of the Christian Indians were killed or taken prisoner. The two Franciscan missionaries who were residing at this place were shot at, but succeeded in escaping.

One of the English soldiers took the figure of the Infant Jesus from the arms of the statue of Nuestra Señora de la Leche in the mission church and brought it to Colonel Palmer. The latter rebuked his men for what they had done and told them that in time they would suffer for their act. Strangely enough, he failed to take his own counsel, and threw the statue of the Child Jesus on the ground. Eight years later, according to tradition, Palmer himself was killed on that very spot. Probably it was twelve years later, when Oglethorpe unsuccessfully besieged Saint Augustine in 1740.

After the enemy left, the Spanish governor ordered the church and friary at Nombre de Dios to be demolished by powder; and so the little stone church and shrine was blown up and only the ruins remained. However, the Indian town of Nombre de Dios with its church and shrine did not cease to exist; for it was moved to within "a musket shot" of the Castillo de San Marcos, the presidio or fort which stood at the northern end of the city of Saint Augustine. And by October 5 of the same year, a new stone mission church and Shrine of Nuestra Señora de la Leche had been built outside the walls on the north side of Saint Augustine. This we learn from a letter which was written on that day. The letter also tells us that in its new location the town was also known as Macariz; and it describes the mission church as the best among those which were in Indian villages, for it contained the statue of Nuestra Señora de la Leche, and its walls were built of lime and stone, although its roof was of palm. Furthermore, this Indian town was to be distinguished from another called Nombre de Dios Chiquito, which was likewise only a musket shot away from the presidio but formerly had been two leagues distant.

The spot where the new mission church of Nombre de Dios and Shrine of Nuestra Señora de la Leche was built in 1728 is, according to tradition, the same where the first holy Mass was offered for the Spanish colony which settled at Saint Augustine. This town was the earliest permanent white settlement within the present confines of the United States. It was founded in 1565 by Don Pedro Menendez de Avilés, foremost naval commander of his day and *adelantado* of Philip II's Spanish fleet.

He had come from Spain with a fleet carrying six hundred colonists and soldiers. Four secular priests accompanied them as chaplains, the chief one being Father Martin Francisco Lopez de Mendoza Grajales. Two others were Father Rodrigo García de Trujillo and Father Solis de Meras.

Reaching the harbor of what is now Saint Augustine on August 28, Menendez named the place for the saint of the day, Saint Augustine (San Agustín). After a week of reconnoitering, he entered the harbor on September 6, and officially landed on the 8th, Our Lady's birthday.

Carrying the cross and followed by the troops, Father Lopez de Mendoza went in procession to meet the commander and his staff. On bended knee, Menendez kissed the cross; and then he planted it firmly in the soil of the new land. This ceremony was followed by a holy Mass in honor of Our Lady's Nativity, which was offered up by Father Lopez de Mendoza. According to tradition, the site of these historic events lies along Ocean Street in present-day Saint Augustine. It is marked by a rustic altar and by the restored mission church of Nombre de Dios which is at the same time the Shrine of Nuestra Señora de la Leche.

It is quite certain that the original mission of Nombre de Dios, built no doubt of poles and palm and having a thatched roof, and situated a short distance to the north of the town of Saint Augustine, was the first permanent mission among the natives, not only of Florida, but of the entire United States. Some are of the opinion that this mission was founded in 1565; and if that is correct, the founder must have been Father García de Trujillo, the first parish priest of Saint Augustine; for the other three chaplains of the Spanish fleet did not remain in the newly founded colony.

Father Rodrigo García de Trujillo was also the builder of the first church in the United States, the parish church of Saint Augustine, which was no doubt erected already in 1565, to serve the first Catholic parish in the United States, comprising the pioneer settlers of the town of Saint Augustine.

The following year, 1566, the first missionaries of the recently founded Society of Jesus arrived in Spanish Florida to do missionary work among the natives. After nine of their number had won the martyr's crown, one in 1566 near St. John's River, Florida, and the others in 1571 on the Rappahannock River, Virginia, the survivors left in 1572 for a new mission field in Mexico.

Franciscans succeeded the Jesuits as missionaries to the natives of Spanish Florida in 1573; and the pioneers established their headquarters at the Spanish frontier fort of Santa Elena, the present Port Royal, South Carolina. However, we have no record of their pioneering, except the report that in 1578 Father Alonso Cavezas was serving as chaplain at the fort of Saint Augustine, while Father Francisco del Castillo was chaplain of the fort at Santa Elena.

In November, 1584, five Franciscans arrived at Saint Augustine and there established the first Franciscan friary in the United

States, with its own little chapel. Both the friary and its chapel were dedicated to the Immaculate Conception; and hence the chapel of the friary was the first chapel to be placed under the patronage of Our Lady in the United States. However, the special Shrine of Nuestra Señora de la Leche which was subsequently opened at the Nombre de Dios mission may rightly claim to have been the first separate Shrine of Our Lady in United States territory.

It was probably in 1584 that Nombre de Dios became a Franciscan mission; and it remained such until the end of the first Spanish period, that is until 1763. Twelve more Franciscans arrived in Florida in 1587, six in 1590, and eleven in 1595. Not all of the earlier arrivals remained; but the year 1595 marks the beginning of extraordinary progress in winning the Indians of Spanish Florida for the Faith; and this continued until 44 mission centers had been established among them in the seventeenth century.

At Saint Augustine the Franciscans sometimes also served as parish priests. The first pastor, Father García de Trujillo, continued to serve faithfully in that capacity for over a quarter century, from 1565 to 1593, although he seems to have been absent at intervals. Anyhow, in 1593 he was "very old, broken by his twenty-eight years' labor there and his previous service as navy chaplain."

His immediate successor for a half year, from January to July, 1594, was Father Diego Escobar de Sambrana. During the next three years, from July 1594 to July 1597, Father Francisco Marrón, the superior of the Franciscan friary which had been opened in Saint Augustine a decade earlier, served also as pastor. This we learn from the extant church records of the Saint Augustine parish, which go back to the year 1594. They are the oldest written records in our country; and those for the years from 1594 to 1763 are now safely stored in the University of Notre Dame vaults, although copies are in the possession of the Historical Society of Saint Augustine.

The first entry in the baptismal records of Saint Augustine is that of the baptism of Maria Ximenes de la Cueva administered by Father Escobar de Sambrana on June 25, 1594. Father Marrón administered twenty-four baptisms from July 6, 1594, to June

10, 1597. Then a new parish priest in the person of Father Artur, who had left Spain on Sept. 23, 1596, was placed in charge; but in 1606-1608 we again find entries by Franciscans of the local friary.

Thus the records continue for 170 years, although several volumes are missing. Whenever the parish priest was absent and during intervals when there was no parish priest, his place was taken by a Franciscan of Saint Augustine. Excerpts from the baptismal records from 1594 to 1736 (not including three additional volumes for 1737-1763), supplied to the writer by Emily L. Wilson, show that during these 143 years no less than 114 different Franciscan Fathers administered the sacrament of baptism in the parish church of Saint Augustine.

Concerning the individual Indian missions of Florida only fragmentary and meagre details have come down to us in extant reports. The Nombre de Dios mission, for instance, is first mentioned by name in a report of 1596. In 1602, three other Indian towns were subject to it, namely Capuaca, Soloy, and Paliaca, which were respectively one, two and three leagues distant; and the total number of Christian Indians was 200. Father Pedro Bermejo was the resident missionary at this time. Perhaps it was he who placed the first statue of Nuestra Señora de la Leche in his mission church and thus made it the famous shrine of Our Lady that it came to be.

The devotion to Our Lady as Nursing Mother of the Infant Jesus and Patroness of all Christian Mothers can be traced to the earliest times. One of the few drawings of Our Lady found on the walls of the second-century Roman catacombs represents her as nursing the Child Jesus; and this subject has been a favorite among artists during all subsequent times.

In 1598, however, the devotion to Nuestra Señora de la Leche y Buen Parto came into prominence in Madrid, Spain, when a devout couple rescued a statue of the Blessed Virgin Mary having this title from irreverent hands and gave it a place of honor in their home.

Some time later, when the mother of this home and her unborn child were in almost certain danger of death, the father took his recourse to Nuestra Señora de la Leche y Buen Parto; and Our

Lady heard his prayers in a remarkable way, granting to his wife a happy delivery. The grateful couple then propagated the devotion by telling other families of the great favor they had received through Mary's powerful intercession.

So well known did this devotion become in a short time that King Philip III of Spain had a special shrine built for the statue of Nuestra Señora de la Leche. The original chapel and statue in the Church of San Luis in Madrid were destroyed by fire at the hands of the Communists during the Spanish Civil War, on May 13, 1937.

Colonists from Spain brought the devotion to Nuestra Señora de la Leche also to the New World at an early date. Thus a Franciscan friary and its church at Matanzas, Cuba, was dedicated to Nuestra Señora de la Leche; and the Florida mission church of Nombre de Dios became a shrine in her honor by at least 1620.

It is well to mention in passing that only a few years later, in 1625, another Shrine of Our Lady was established in Santa Fe, New Mexico. In that year Father Alonso de Benavides brought a statue of Our Lady of the Assumption from Mexico to the parish church in Santa Fe, and by 1628 or 1629 had built a new parish church with a special Lady Chapel. The present Cathedral of Santa Fe likewise has a Lady Chapel, dating from 1718, where the ancient statue is still held in honor under the title of Our Lady of the Conquest. (The story of this statue and shrine is told in a charming manner in Fray Angelico Chavez' recent book, *La Conquistadora.*)

When the mission church of Nombre de Dios became the shrine also of Nuestra Señora de la Leche in 1620, it was probably still a poor structure of poles and palm, and very likely stood on its original site which was only a quarter of a league from the town of Saint Augustine. At least, that was its location indicated in a report of 1655.

In 1665 the English buccaneer Davis invaded and sacked the town of Saint Augustine, and probably also destroyed the mission and shrine at Nombre de Dios. Afterwards the latter were rebuilt a little farther north of Saint Augustine, for a report of the year 1675 tells us that they were situated one-half league from Saint Augustine.

The rebuilt mission and shrine were very likely destroyed by fire when ex-governor Moore of South Carolina and Colonel Robert Daniel, unable to capture the fort at Saint Augustine, burned the city on Oct. 22, 1702.

When the city was rebuilt, the Spaniards began using for the churches and public buildings a material which they found on a neighboring island and which they called "coquina." It was a concrete consisting of broken shells cemented with shell lime. No doubt it was at this time that they built the "stone" church and shrine, which is mentioned as standing in the Indian village of Nombre de Dios by a report of Dec. 1, 1726.

After the English attack in March, 1728, this Indian village with its church and shrine was transferred to a place near the presidio of St. Augustine; and there it has remained since then.

When the Spaniards left in 1763 and Florida became a British possession, the mission chapel of Nuestra Señora de la Leche was destroyed or fell into ruins. It was restored, no doubt, during the second Spanish period, 1783 to 1821; but there was nothing left of it in 1873, when Bishop Verot rebuilt the shrine. The very next year, however, it was blown down by a storm.

The present structure was erected in 1915-1918 by Bishop Curley. It was restored and furnished as a chapel in 1925 by Mrs. Hardin in memory of her husband, General Martin D. Hardin. None of the furnishings are older than the building itself; but it has a replica of the ancient statue of Nuestra Señora de la Leche, and there is a diorama depicting the "first parish Mass" in the United States, offered up by Father Lopez de Mendoza Grajales in 1565. Here is also the outer coffin of Menendez, the founder of Saint Augustine, whose tomb is in his native town of Avilés in Spain.

There are other reminders in Saint Augustine of the old Spanish days, for instance the old cathedral which was built, in the Moorish type of architecture, as a new parish church during the second Spanish period. It was dedicated on the feast of the Immaculate Conception in 1796. Only during the next century did it become a cathedral when Florida east of the Apalachicola River was erected into a vicariate apostolic in 1857 and into a diocese in 1870.

It is of interest to note that already in 1598, after the Bishop of Havana had conferred on the new parish priest of Saint

Augustine, Father Artur, all the faculties he was empowered to give, the Council of the Indies looked with favor upon the suggestion that a separate bishop be appointed for Florida "for the conservation and spread of the Faith on the peninsula." Though nothing came of the plan, several bishops from Cuba visited Florida during Spanish times and one resided in Saint Augustine for ten years. The latter was the Franciscan Bishop Martinez Tejada Diez de Velasco, auxiliary of Santiago de Cuba, 1736 to 1745.

The old cathedral of Saint Augustine was partially destroyed by fire in 1887. When it was rebuilt the north wall was extended and the arms of the cross were lengthened. In the façade still hang the original chimes, one of which bears the date 1682. The beautiful campanile was built in 1888 and provided with a new set of bells.

Also reminding us of the Spanish colonial times are the narrow streets of the old city, for instance Treasury Street which is only seven feet wide at the east end, and St. George Street, only seventeen feet wide, which is the main thoroughfare extending north and south through the center of the city to the old gateway. The latter, with about thirty feet of wall on each side, is all that is left of the old city wall, built of "coquina."

The old city, protected also by a sea wall, extended for about a mile along the ocean from the Franciscan Friary of the Immaculate Conception (now St. Francis Barracks, with only a small portion of the friary walls standing) to the Castillo de San Marcos (renamed Fort Marion). The Castillo or presidio, now a National Monument, is still for the most part in the condition in which the Spaniards left it. The former residence of the Spanish governors is now a customs house and post office. And in the Cathedral Plaza is a shaft of marble set up by the Spanish colonists of the second period as a memorial of the Spanish liberal constitution of 1812-1813.

Surrounded as they are by these mementos of the three centuries and more during which Saint Augustine was a Spanish colonial town, visitors as well as residents of our oldest city do not find it strange that the reconstructed old shrine of Nuestra Señora de la Leche y Buen Parto should attract so much attention. Especially in recent years, Father John J. Fitzpatrick, the director of the shrine, tells us, it "has been the center of the devotion of thousands of mothers and mothers-to-be. Those who were able have journeyed with their husbands to kneel before the altar of Our Lady's chapel to ask for the multiple blessings of motherhood for themselves and the protection of Christ's Mother for their families. Every year other thousands write to the Father Director asking that their names be placed on Our Lady's altar and that they be remembered in the Masses and prayers at the Shrine. The files at the Shrine office are filled with letters of thanksgiving from grateful mothers who lovingly point out the miraculous things which Our Lady has accomplished for them."

MARION A. HABIG, O.F.M.

St. Louis, Mo.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES, PATRON OF WRITERS

Catholic Press month calls to mind that St. Francis de Sales is the official patron of writers. This title was conferred on him in 1923 by Pius XI in the encyclical letter *Rerum omnium*. "Since St. Francis, up to this time, has not been named the Patron of Writers in any solemn and public documents of this Apostolic See, We take this happy occasion, after mature deliberation and in full knowledge, by Our apostolic authority, hereby to publish, confirm, and declare by this encyclical . . . St. Francis de Sales, Bishop of Geneva and Doctor of the Church, as the heavenly patron of all writers."

Francis was born in the castle of Sales in 1567. Even before formal school training began he showed an interest in learning. To his nurse he made a childish promise: "If you will teach me to read, I will give you a new red dress every year when I am a man." On the completion of his primary education he was sent at the age of thirteen to Paris. There under the direction of the Jesuits he studied rhetoric and philosophy. Afterwards, in keeping with his father's wish, he went to Padua to become a lawyer. Since he secretly aspired to the priesthood, he also studied theology. Under his tutor, Possevin, a Jesuit, he became acquainted with the writings of St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, Cardinal Bellarmine, and the Fathers. He was particularly drawn to St. Cyprian. One of the tasks he imposed on himself was the composition of selections imitating the style of these favorite authors.

The writings of St. Francis de Sales fall into two main categories—those concerned with his mission of conversion in the Chablais region and those dealing with his spiritual teachings. In the first group are classed his works against the Reformers. These include the *Controversies,* the *Standard of the Cross,* and various small treatises. The Chablais, somewhat of a pawn in the religious wars of the Reformation, had recently come again under the rule of the Catholic duke of Savoy, Charles Emmanuel. At his instigation Claude Granier, Bishop of Geneva, sent to it the young priest, Francis de Sales, to convert those who had fallen into the error of Calvinism. Since often these people would not listen to his preaching, the missionary began to circulate among them small papers on the Catholic faith, each of which was written by hand. Thus the modern pamphleteer finds a forerunner in St. Francis de Sales. Thirty-six years after the saint's death incomplete and unrevised copies of these papers were found. These were collected in a volume and presented to Pope Alexander III. They are known as the *Controversies.*

This mission to the Chablais, which lasted four years, greatly influenced Francis' style of writing. He had to spend most of the day preaching, fruitless though that seemed. When he wrote, he did so in haste. Except for the Bible and his Bellarmine, he had no books. He had to choose words intelligible to a simple people, and at the same time he burned to communicate to them his deep conviction of the truth of the Catholic faith. Thus he could not use any artificiality. His language was somewhat strong, and his style was characterized by irony. Yet at the same time a spirit of charity pervaded these papers, and the heretical ministers warned their followers against being won over by what they termed the flatteries of this missionary priest. In 1650 the Commission inquiring into the possibility of the saint's canonization stated that in these papers Francis de Sales had defended the faith as well as had formerly Athanasius, Ambrose, and Augustine.

The *Standard of the Cross* was published in 1600. In keeping with an old Catholic custom a cross had been publicly set up at Annemasse, near Calvinist Geneva. The Protestant minister LaFaye protested vehemently. On the order of his bishop, Francis answered this attack by a treatise on the cross.

The spiritual teachings of the saint consist of his sermons, letters, and his published treatises. During the course of his life he preached more than 4,000 sermons. In great part these have not been preserved, and of those that do remain there is a question of authenticity. Yet it is known that he had a great reputation as a preacher, and in part this was due to his mastery of language. The Bull *Dives in misericordia* of Pius IX, which conferred on St. Francis the title of Doctor of the Church, states of his sermons: "He gave the wisest precepts, and, by the example of the Holy Fathers, caused the dignity of sacred eloquence, which had been lowered in the lapse of time, to be restored to its ancient splendour. And from this school came forth most eloquent orators who produced such abundant fruit in the whole Church. Therefore, he was held by all to be the restorer and master of sacred eloquence."

Of his letters about 1,000 remain. They cover a wide variety of subjects, as, for example, recommendations to a young lady thinking of marriage, instructions on the duties of the married state, advice on the excessive love of parents for their children, counsels on the practice of virtues. In them the saint speaks from his heart, pointing out to others the easy and straight way to perfection. Like all letters they approach the free style of conversation, and in them are found many pithy sayings for which the saint is well known. Thus in discussing pride he writes: "Eyes must be very true to avoid being deceived when we look at ourselves."

Among Francis de Sales' published treatises are the *Introduction to a Devout Life* and the *Treatise on the Love of God*. The *Introduction* evolved from a series of letters of direction which he had sent to Madame de Charmoisy. Covering a period of two years they represented a large body of instruction. On learning of their existence the saint's confessor pressured him to have them published. Since sometime before, Henry IV, king of France, had also asked him to write a book on religion suitable for all classes of society, Francis took these letters, added others written during the same period, and published them in the form of a book in 1608. This work was immediately hailed as a classic, a reputation which it has maintained over the years. In *Rerum omnium* Pius XI says of it: "May it please God that this book, the most perfect of its kind in the opinion of contemporaries of the saint, be read now as it formerly was by practically everyone. If this were done, Christian piety certainly would flourish the world over and the Church of God could rejoice in the assurance of a widespread attainment of holiness by her children."

The *Treatise on the Love of God* represents the fullness of St. Francis' teaching. Like most of his other works it was written in moments snatched from an incredibly busy life. In one of his letters he refers to the difficulty of finding time to compose the book: "I do what I can for the book. Be sure that it is a great martyrdom to be unable to gain the time required; still I get on well." The subject matter is profound. Yet the style is graceful, and the work in a very true sense is a history of his own love of God. In another of his letters the saint wrote: "I am going to put my hand to the book of the Love of God, and will try to write as much on my heart as on the paper."

So great was his love for writing about the things of God that Francis intended to resign his office as bishop and retire among the Benedictines of Talloires to give himself entirely to God, as he said, "with my breviary, my rosary, and my pen." He planned a series of studies on the New Testament, a treatise on the love of one's neighbor, and letters to a parish priest on the duties of his charge. But God willed otherwise, and on Dec. 29, 1622, the saint left this life for his heavenly reward.

St. Francis de Sales was not only gifted with a fine mind, but he also had the ability of expressing himself in writing. The French language of his day was marked by pedantry, affectation, and fantastic metaphor. The saint rose above these faults, and clearly, simply, and forcefully expressed his thoughts. At times he did this with great beauty. So much did he influence the French language that sixteen years after his death the Academy enrolled him among its members. But great as is the literary merit of his works, still greater is their influence on the spiritual formation of souls. Pius XI says of him: "It would be impossible to exaggerate the value of his books and pamphlets. . . . These books ought to be distributed as widely as possible among Catholics, for his writings are easy to understand and can be read with great pleasure. They cannot but inspire in the souls of the faithful a love of true and solid piety."

In St. Francis de Sales' personal life of holiness, in his love of study, his mastery of language, and zeal for souls all Catholic writers find material for imitation. Again Pius XI writes: "It is necessary that they, in their writings, imitate and exhibit at all times that strength joined always to moderation and charity, which was the special characteristic of St. Francis. He, by his example, teaches them in no uncertain manner precisely how they should write. In the first place, and this the most important of all, each writer should endeavor in every way and as far as this may be possible to obtain a complete comprehension of the teachings of the Church. They should never compromise where the truth is involved, nor, because of fear of possibly offending an opponent, minimize or dissimulate it. They should pay particular attention to literary style and should try to express their thoughts clearly and in beautiful language so that their readers will the more readily come to love the truth. When it is necessary to enter into controversy, they should be prepared to refute error and to overcome the wiles of the wicked, but always in a way that will demonstrate clearly that they are animated by the highest principles and moved only by Christian charity."

EDWARD J. CARNEY, O.S.F.S

De Sales Hall
Hyattsville, Md.

THEOLOGY FOR THE UNDERGRAD

A creeping transformation is afoot in the American Catholic college. One New England institution offers its students a total of sixteen semester hours of "theology." A mid-western college includes twenty-two hours of "religion" in its four-year curriculum, while another in the South offers eight under the same caption. Two more in the East have eight- and sixteen-hour programs in "theology," respectively. And so goes the trend, for these colleges are typical.

But typical of what? Certainly not of a uniformity in the number of class hours devoted to the study of God's revelation. Eight and twenty-two (and this latter figure could be topped) are hardly uniform.

These five college religion programs pattern a trend to transformation in course titling. The transformation is simply that the programs in *religion* formerly offered in the halls of Catholic higher education are today rapidly becoming programs in *theology.*

Or are they?

What is a course in "religion" and what is a course in "theology"? Are they merely different labels for the same article or are they genuinely different articles? Many college administrators manifestly see them as two peas in a pod. To me they look more like a pea and the whole plant.

Have the religion courses formerly offered in our Catholic colleges really become so much more comprehensive and scientific that they now merit the sublime name of theology? Has there been a change in the content of these courses, a change that is well expressed by a shiny new title?

Now, of course, mere titles are hardly of apocalyptic importance. Even tragic misnaming doesn't fool all of the people all of the time. But the trouble is that it does fool too many of them for too much of the time.

Are undergraduate "theology departments" (and, we might add, adult education programs) fooling anybody? Perhaps. But we can hardly settle that question unless we agree on what theology really is. Now we all know that theology deals with God and man's relations with God, and so I am not wondering about that. But I am wondering about the precise point at which this study of God passes from the toddler stage of religion to the mature level of theology. In the same way we might ask when the study of mathematics passes from the level of arithmetic to that of differential equations.

As far as I can see there are at least five clearly distinguishable levels of knowledge about God's message to man. Of course, within these five there are sub-levels, but they are not so neatly disparate. Once we have pulled these categories apart we can more easily put our finger on the beginning of real theology and decide whether or not we have it in our colleges.

1.) Catechism level. Here I would put that grasp of sacred doctrine possessed not only by the ten- or twelve-year-old, but also that of the ordinary, not-too-well instructed Catholic adult. This knowledge of revelation is typical of the vast majority of the faithful.

2.) Pre-technical level. Name-assigning is difficult here. Into this category would fall the "well-instructed" layman—the man or woman who has an adequate comprehension of the more obvious truths of faith but little of their sub- or superstructures. A small minority of the laity and a great majority of brothers and sisters can probably hang their umbrellas on this floor.

3.) Major seminary level. Now we begin to get technical and complicated. The seminarian-theologian is expected to see the whys and wherefores and to exhibit at least a basic understanding of the sub- and superstructures we were talking about. To climb to this floor philosophy is indispensable for, as Pius XI has said, "one unskilled in philosophy can never become a competent theologian."

4.) Professional level. We are in the clouds. Here dwell the specialists, men who devote a lifetime to digging out and elucidating the riches of divine revelation. These riches they propound on the platform, in the classroom, and through the textbook.

5.) Creative level. Here belong the all-time giants, men of amazing intellectual depth who have originated explanations, analyses, and whole systems. They have grappled with the divine word and have executed monuments of theology. At this peak belong, among others, an Augustine, an Aquinas, a Scotus, a Suarez, a Bellarmine, the Salmanticenses.

Now where does theology begin?

I would not hesitate to deny that glorious name to levels one and two and to favor levels three, four, and five with it. There is no doubt at all about our assignments of one, four, and five. Two and three might give trouble.

But really, level two does not merit the title of theology for it is neither extensively complete nor intensively thorough. It scratches the surface, and only a part of the surface at that.

The major seminary (level three), on the other hand, makes a genuine attempt at analysis. The ordinary seminarian in his four-year theological course takes on the average of ninety to a hundred semester hours of theology and Sacred Scripture in addition to courses in philosophy, church history, and canon law. He has had theology.

But do American Catholic colleges teach theology?

Some few probably do. Many do not.

To prove it all you need do is examine course offerings. Here are three striking instances of what I mean. One college in a two-credit course covers religion and revelation, miracles, the divinity of Christ, the nature, marks, and infallibility of the Church. Another institution teaches the act of faith, creation, origin and fall of man, the Incarnation and Redemption, Mariology, and the four last things in a two-credit course. A third college sees the unity and trinity in God, creation, the angels, the fall of man, and eschatology likewise in a two-credit program. Now it is simply impossible to cover the vast amount of material in these courses in any but a superficial way, and yet each of them bears the noble name of theology on its brow.

All, however, is not black. We must note that there are religion courses being offered that do border on the major seminary level. One college, for example, devotes three semester hours to the life of Christ. Well executed, that course could furnish a taste of actual scriptural theology. Another spends three credit hours on God, creation, and providence. Again, there can be here an approach to real theology, especially if some basic philosophical notions are supposed and used. We may not forget either that many of our colleges along with their courses in sacred doctrine are building up strong programs in philosophy. This point is significant in that philosophy and theology often overlap and strengthen each other by parallel courses.

These programs represent an earnest effort and they merit our admiration. It is far from easy for a college administrator to squeeze philosophy and religion into a curriculum clamoring for bread and butter subjects. But, at the same time, *if* a given religion program is not actually comprehensive, why grace it with a comprehensive name? Wouldn't it be better in this eventuality to tell our college men and women that their religion courses are only the merest beginnings, that there are splendid things yet in store for them? Shouldn't the college professor fire his students with the realization that this science of God is profound, vast, and beautiful . . . and that they have still much to learn about it, that they could do nothing better in the quiet moments of their later family life than to delve more deeply into the enchanting sea of God's revelation?

Now I have said that a misnomer is no tragedy. Why all the fuss, then, about what we are going to call our college religion courses or our adult education lectures? After all, "theology" does sound more impressive than "religion." Using the term is good advertising. Why not?

The first reason is patent if you accept what we said regarding those five levels of knowledge about God's revelation. The *ordinary* college coverage hardly transcends the second, non-scientific level. It simply is not theology, but merely religion. For the same reason we would not call an excellent first-aid course surgery. It isn't.

And it is futile to point out—as is done—that the course in sacred doctrine may not be called religion because religion is a moral virtue and not a subject of academic endeavor. The futility of this idea stems from the fact that the word, religion, has more than one meaning. Webster gives nine. Among them are 1.) the moral virtue, 2.) a system of an organized sect, 3.) a course of study. If this line of reasoning were correct, we could not speak of medicine as a field of study because the term already refers to a curative compound.

Secondly, we do a disservice to the lay Catholic. Why encourage him in thinking he knows theology if he does not? After eight or sixteen credit hours he can have added only a modicum to his high school knowledge of religion. And thinking he knows theology may actually work him harm. He may be disillusioned by later contact with problems or objections when he finds that he does not have all the answers. He may even suppose that there are no answers because he has not heard that there was a problem. And *he* has had theology.

Finally, we do a disservice to the queen of the sciences herself. What sort of opinion can a man have of a science that can be taught so facilely and so simply? What will a secularist think of a field of learning if a mere veneer seems to be all it has to offer? Even the college "theologian" can hardly be expected to admire the science of theology if he be allowed to think that at so little cost he has it in his hand.

On this last point I would say that I am in favor of considering the advisability of changing the name of a course from religion to theology (1) when roughly the same number of students fail the course as fail engineering or mathematics or history; (2) when the religion exam occasions as much worry as any other; (3) when the religion mark is not viewed by the student as an average-raiser. In which cases you are probably teaching something.

Have you ever noticed that the ordinary priest smiles when a confrere in jest calls him a theologian? Not that he does not know something about theology—certainly vastly more than the collegiate "theologian." The usual priest simply has a high regard for the sacred science and those really expert in it. He has studied enough about theology to know that in his four-year course he has merely dipped the oar. He has peered sufficiently into the classical scholastic debates to grant that he really does not grasp what they are all about. That is why he smiles when he is called a theologian.

I think his smile is healthy.

THOMAS DUBAY, S.M.

Notre Dame Seminary
New Orleans, La.

CATHOLICS IN COLONIAL AMERICA

PART II

The other major European nation, with whose colonizing projects in the future United States the Catholic Church was closely associated, came on the scene in a serious way almost a century after Spain. The keen commercial rivalry of the maritime powers in the early seventeenth century provided France with the principal motive for its entry to North America. Simultaneously the remarkable revival of the Catholic faith in that country furnished a constant procession of missionaries in search of converts among the Indian tribes of the inland regions traversed by the French explorers and *coureurs-de-bois*. In France, too, Church and State were at the time united, and since the concordat of 1516 the crown had enjoyed the right of nominating to vacant bishoprics and to newly established sees. The control exercised by the State over ecclesiastical affairs in France's North American colonies was never as rigid as in the case of Spain. That this was so was due in no small measure to the precedents set by the forceful François de Montmorency Laval, the first bishop of New France, who arrived in the colony in 1659. Of this bishop it has recently been said:

> In all, Laval guided the destinies of the Church in New France for thirty-four years, ruling in a more authoritarian and absolute fashion than any representative of the all-powerful Sun King. He left more of a mark upon the colony than any governor except the great Frontenac, with whom he had quarreled violently. . . .[23]

The union of Church and State in New France was none the less real, and it was the basis for many a contest that was waged between the two in the French settlements in and around the Great Lakes and the Mississippi Valley.

It was in May, 1611, that relief for the hard-pressed little French community in Acadia arrived, and on board the *Grâce de Dieu* were two French Jesuits, Pierre Biard and Ennémond Massé, who had come to serve as missionaries at Port Royal. But two years later this first effort of the French Church in the new world was brought to a sudden end when the English freebooter, Sir Samuel

---

[23] Mason Wade, *The French Canadians, 1760-1945* (Toronto, 1955), p. 39.

Argall, fell upon the French at Mount Desert Island, killed one Jesuit, and carried off the remainder as captives. The French religious were not, however, discouraged by so grim a start, and in June, 1615, four Récollets, as the French Franciscans were then called, arrived at Quebec and soon pushed on to the west where on August 12 Joseph Le Caron, one of their number, said the first Mass in what was to be the Province of Ontario in a cabin built for him by the Hurons. Within a decade the Jesuits returned to New France, and from the early 1630's it was they who took the lead in advancing the Church's cause among the red men. Among these pioneers was Jean de Brébeuf, who after a winter with the Montagnais tribe, set off in 1626 for the western country where he spent the better part of three years learning the Huron language and gaining a thorough knowledge of their customs. Enriched by a background of this kind, the intrepid Norman drew up a detailed set of instructions in 1637 for his confrères who were destined for the Huron missions. They embraced a frightening array of directions on the most minute points about how to receive the Indians' unpalatable food, to light their fires and pipes, and to endure their insults and taunts. It was particularly important to conceal any sign of fatigue or weakness, no matter how difficult the task assigned, and if any of the future missionaries should have thought that their superior knowledge might impress the natives, they were quickly disillusioned, for Brébeuf told them:

> This is a lesson which is easy enough to learn, but very difficult to put into practice; for, leaving a highly civilized community, you fall into the hands of barbarous people who care but little for your Philosophy or your Theology. All the fine qualities which might make you loved and respected in France are like pearls trampled under the feet of swine, or rather of mules, which utterly despise you when they see that you are not as good pack animals as they are. If you go naked, and carry the load of a horse upon your back, as they do, then you would be wise according to their doctrine, and would be recognized as a great man, otherwise not.[24]

---

[24] "Instructions for the Fathers of Our Society Who Shall be Sent to the Hurons," by Jean de Brébeuf, S.J., incorporated into the relation of Paul le Jeune, S.J., for 1637, Reuben Gold Thwaites (Ed.), *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (Cleveland, 1898), XII, 123. For a recent scholarly treatment of certain aspects of these missions cf. John H. Kennedy, *Jesuit and Savage in New France* (New Haven, 1950).

It was not a pretty prospect, surely, but it was based on experience and through the coming years it proved to be all too real. If these French priests had not been made of stern stuff, and if their souls had not been kindled by a deep and abiding faith, they would soon have abandoned the difficult goal they had assigned themselves. But they did not turn back, and the story of their sufferings at the hands of the savages in the 1640's remains one of the most heroic tales in our colonial past. From the time when Isaac Jogues, after incredible tortures, was felled beneath the axe of an Iroquois near the little village of Auriesville, New York, in October, 1646, to the murder of Gabriel Lalemant and Brébeuf himself on Georgian Bay in March, 1649, the slaughter continued until the insensate hate of the Iroquois against the Hurons and their friends seemed for a time to abate. One of the most moving passages in Francis Parkman is his description of the almost superhuman courage of Brébeuf in standing up to the bitter end to the tortures of his captors. He wrote:

> Thus died Jean de Brébeuf, the founder of the Huron mission, its truest hero, and its greatest martyr. He came of a noble race—the same, it is said, from which sprang the English Earls of Arundel; but never had the mailed barons of his line confronted a fate so appalling, with so prodigious a constancy. To the last he refused to flinch, and "his death was the astonishment of his murderers."[25]

The Huron mission had failed, but the Blackrobes did not quit New France. Instead they directed their eyes westward toward Lake Superior where Isaac Jogues, one of the Iroquois martyrs, had reached as early as 1641. These were the years that saw a renewal of war in Europe and a more aggressive policy upon the part of France once Louis XIV had assumed personal control of the government in 1661. As a consequence, rivalry for the mastery of North America was intensified and Jean Talon, the royal intendant of New France, laid plans to forestall competition in the heart of the continent. On June 4, 1671, Simon François Daumont, Sieur de Saint Lusson, acting as Talon's representative, took formal possession of the entire western country in the name of God and Louis XIV. In this ceremony at Sault Ste. Marie, to which the chiefs of all the neighboring tribes had been invited,

---

[25] Francis Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century* (Boston, 1910), II, 213-14.

Father Claude Alloüez, already a veteran in those parts, played a prominent role. After the cross and the standard of the king had been raised aloft as the symbols of the dual auspices of the undertaking, Alloüez preached a sermon in which he explained to the savages the doctrine of Christ's redemption of mankind on the cross. Then pointing to the royal banner he said, "But look likewise at that other post, to which are affixed the armorial bearings of the great Captain of France whom we call King. He lives beyond the sea; he is the Captain of the greatest Captains, and has not his equal in the world."[26] Thus were Church and State joined at that remote spot on Lake Superior to advance the policies of Louis XIV, Colbert, and Louvois.

The succeeding years bore greater fruit for the Jesuits' missions than they had hitherto known, and by 1673 there were 1,800 refugee Ottawas and Hurons resident at St. Ignace Mission on the north shore of the Straits of Mackinac. South and west from these far northern bases the Blackrobes fanned out into the future States of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Illinois, and as the civil and military arms of France advanced upon the Mississippi they were either in the vanguard like Alloüez—tracking for thirty years over the prairies and through the forests of the Old Northwest—or like Jacques Marquette, in company with Louis Jolliet, reaching down to the borders of the Southwest. During the time that Marquette had spent at La Pointe de Saint Esprit on the south shore of Lake Superior he had received visits from far-away tribesmen, including the Illinois, who spoke to him of a great river and asked that he come among them. The thought of establishing a mission for these Indians was uppermost in his mind, therefore, when in May, 1673, he set out with Jolliet on their famous expedition. In the long and arduous months that lay ahead the missionary was sustained by his hopes for the conversion of the Illinois and by his deep and abiding faith in God and the Mother of Christ. No one has written more majestically of this personal devotion of Marquette for the Blessed Mother than Parkman who, although he in no way shared in the Jesuit's sentiments, yet appreciated the beauty and elevation of his thoughts. Parkman said of Marquette:

---

[26] The description of the ceremony was given by Claude Dablon, S.J., in his relation for 1670-1671, *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (Cleveland, 1899), LV, 111.

> He was a devout votary of the Virgin Mary, who, imaged to his mind in shapes of the most transcendent loveliness with which the pencil of human genius has ever informed the canvas, was to him the object of an adoration not unmingled with a sentiment of chivalrous devotion. The longings of a sensitive heart, divorced from earth, sought solace in the skies. A subtle element of romance was blended with the fervor of his worship, and hung like an illumined cloud over the harsh and hard realities of his daily lot. Kindled by the smile of his celestial mistress, his gentle and noble nature knew no fear. For her he burned to dare and to suffer, discover new lands and conquer new realms to her sway.[27]

Before this great missionary gave up his life in May, 1675, near where the river which bears his name empties into Lake Michigan, he had the joy of opening the mission of the Immaculate Conception for the Illinois near the present village of Utica, although his failing health permitted him to remain with them for only a brief stay. But others came to take his place and gradually a network of Jesuit stations dotted the shores of the Great Lakes and the banks of the rivers of the Middle West.

Meanwhile other French missionaries appeared in these inland regions to supplement the Society of Jesus in affording religious ministrations to the white settlers in the wilderness and to seek converts among the red men. The principal groups were Récollets, the secular priests, and the Capuchins. It was a Récollet, Louis Hennepin, who explored the upper Mississippi in 1680 as far north as where Minneapolis stands today and gave to the Falls of St. Anthony its name. Hennepin's confrères, Gabriel de la Ribourde and Zénobe Membré, saw service with the tribes of northern Illinois before they both met violent deaths, the former in September, 1680, at the hands of the Kickapoo near Seneca, and the latter with a fellow religious, Maxim Le Clercq, in January, 1689, as survivors of La Salle's ill-starred venture on the gulf coast of Texas. As for the secular priests, a number of those trained at the missionary seminary of Bishop Laval at Quebec played a part as missionaries to the Indians of the Middle West and as pastors of the infant parishes in the frontier towns. Having received authorization in May, 1698, to open missions for certain tribes along the Mississippi, these priests evangelized the Tamarois around Kaskaskia and Cahokia in southern Illinois and worked farther down the river with the Arkansas, the Natchez, and the Tonicas. They also served as pastors to the French as, for example, when one of their number, Henri Roulleux de la Vente, was installed in September, 1704, as first pastor of the Church of the Immaculate Conception at Fort Louis, the forerunner of the present city of Mobile. After the French had established the new colony of Louisiana in the early years of the eighteenth century an agreement was made in May, 1722, for the entry of the Capuchins, and the ministrations of these friars were destined to endure throughout the century and beyond the time of Louisiana's purchase by the United States.

---

[27] Francis Parkman, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West* (Boston, 1910), pp. 59-60. Parkman revealed here a common error among many non-Catholics concerning Catholics' devotion and veneration for the Mother of God. "Adoration" in Catholic theology is reserved exclusively for God.

It was fortunate for the Catholic religion that the Récollets, Capuchins, and secular priests had been enrolled, for the disaster which befell the Jesuits in the colonies of Spain had been visited even earlier upon their French brothers. It was in July, 1763, that the superior council at New Orleans ordered their banishment from Louisiana and the Illinois Country. The execution of this decree added one of the most dismal pages to the history of the Church in colonial America. The ban was carried out at two main places, in New Orleans for the Province of Louisiana, and at the Jesuit residence about fifteen miles from Fort Chartres for the Illinois Country. After the missionaries had been rounded up, all their property was confiscated and sold at public auction, and even their chapels were not spared. The royal decree had commanded that the chapel ornaments and sacred vessels in New Orleans should be given to the Capuchins, which was done. As François Philibert Watrin, the Jesuit superior in Illinois, remarked in his description of these events some months later, "it was the least objectionable use that could be made of them."[28] The chapel was then razed to the ground and the cemetery where for thirty years the Jesuits had buried their dead was exposed to profanation. When news of this later reached France it brought astonishment and horror to many who often queried the returned Jesuits about it.

---

[28] "Banishment of the Jesuits from Louisiana," by François Philibert Watrin, S.J., Paris, Sept. 3, 1764. *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (Cleveland, 1900), LXX, 265.

"It has been said to them," wrote Watrin, "that this was only to be expected from open enemies of the Catholic religion; the Jesuits could only answer these sayings by silence."[29] Similar depredations took place at the Illinois chapel where the shelves of the altar were thrown down, the linings of the ornaments given to colored women of shady reputation, and the chandeliers and the large crucifix that had hung above the altar were deposited above a cupboard in a house of ill fame. It was small wonder that the old Jesuit should have concluded, "To see the marks of spoliation in the chapel, one might have thought that it was the enemies of the Catholic religion who had caused it."[30]

In a certain sense the French colonial officials who carried out the banishment of the Jesuits from Louisiana and the Illinois Country were enemies of the Catholic religion, although nominally they were of that religious belief. The rationalist movement had taken a heavy toll on the faith of French officialdom in the thirty years since Father Watrin had left his native land. The spirit that had destroyed the Jesuits' American missions appeared in the mother country a generation later in a more violent form when the other religious orders, and the Church itself, were temporarily extinguished during the reign of terror. In any case, the removal of the Jesuits from Louisiana and the Illinois Country, coming as it did a few months after the Treaty of Paris in which France lost most of its North American colonies to Great Britain, was a severe blow to the Church in the colonial West.

The results obtained by the Society of Jesus during the century and a half since Biard and Massé had landed in Acadia were in no way commensurate with the efforts they had expended and the sacrifices they had endured. The overwhelming majority of the Indians of the Great Lakes, the central West, and the Mississippi Valley clung to their pagan deities and refused to accept the Catholic faith. But there was more to the story than Parkman thought when he remarked that the guns and tomahawks of the Iroquois were the ruin of the Jesuits' hopes.[31] Ruin they certainly were of the hopes for conversion of the tribes as a whole. Yet in the vast host of native peoples whom the Jesuits met they found a considerable number of responsive souls on whom their efforts were not wasted. For example, Catharine Tegahkouita, the Mohawk girl, whom Father Jacques de Lamberville baptized in 1676 at an Indian village near Fonda, New York, led a model Christian life to her death; the Onondaga chief, Daniel Garakonthie, was of the greatest assistance in making peace between warring tribes and in bringing others into the Church after his own baptism at Quebec by Bishop Laval; and the friendly contacts of the Abenaki tribe of Maine with Father Gabriel Druillettes, which began in 1646, eventually led to so firm a conversion on their part that the blandishments and threats of Massachusetts Bay for the better part of a century failed to dislodge them from their Catholic faith.

---

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] *Ibid.*, LXX, 281.

[31] Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America*, II, 273. Even historians like the Beards recognized the intangible value of the sacrifices of these men. To them the empires of the new world were chiefly "predatory operations,"

The Jesuit missionaries of France, just as all the colonial missionaries, were not only trained to expect hardship; they were likewise prepared for failure in the sense that the world reckons failure. But to these men imbued by a vivid and compelling faith in the supernatural, it was not failure to have fifteen of their number die at the hands of the Iroquois and fifteen or more others perish by shipwreck, drowning, and in attendance on the plague stricken. For over 300 of the finest specimens of French manhood to have expended their lives in behalf of the American savages, and after a century and a half to have been able to show such meager results, was in the world's eyes a failure. To the Catholic missionary, however, it was a failure akin to that of the martyrs of the pagan Roman Empire out of whose sufferings in the first three centuries the Church of Europe was born.

Moreover, the other French priests who had worked in the American West at the same time as the Jesuits, and who had remained on after they had gone, stepped into the breach at many of the old missions, as they also kept the faith alive in the French communities of the wilderness. Thus at New Orleans, Mobile, Natchez, St. Louis, Kaskaskia, Vincennes, Detroit, and Green

---

but they added, "the heroic deeds of Catholic missionaries, daring for religion's sake torture and death, bore witness to a new force in the making of world dominion." Charles A. and Mary R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization* (New York, 1931), I, 9.

Bay the Catholic Church continued to play a leading part in the restricted lives of the inhabitants. Amid the rough surroundings of the colonial days the spirit of religion, it is true, often burned very low. But it was never completely extinguished, and when these frontier posts were later engulfed in the stirring events of the Revolution and the War of 1812 the French Catholic population was found loyal to the American cause. George Rogers Clark and his Virginia militia experienced that loyalty at first hand when they took Kaskaskia in July, 1778, and found their principal aid in Father Pierre Gibault, the village priest. It was Gibault's influence that won Cahokia and it was he who also tracked through the forests and helped to deliver Vincennes and its neighboring Indians into American hands. The same was true of Father Gabriel Richard, S.S., at Detroit whose strong attachment to the United States the British thought a sufficient warrant for his house arrest during the War of 1812.

Throughout the western expanse, traversed by the missionaries of France and settled by its Catholic people before the American nation was born, there remain today, as in the case of Spain in the Southwest and California, a litany of names of cities, towns, and rivers, that tell of who were once their principal occupants. There are Vincennes and Marquette, and there is St. Louis named to commemorate the saintly Louis IX, as there is Dubuque named for a Canadian descendant of the French, Louisville called after Louis XVI, and Marietta, Ohio, for Marie Antoinette. But more important than place names was the continuity of settlement near the sites of old Jesuit and Récollet missions and in the parishes established by the seminary priests of Quebec. It was to frontier French communities such as these that there came after 1790 learned priest refugees like Benedict Flaget, Stephen Badin, and Gabriel Richard when the whirlwind of revolution broke over the Church of France. In the western wilderness these priests kindled anew the fire of religious faith and enriched the lives of all—Catholic and non-Catholic alike—with their cultured manners and their well-stored minds. One of the most perceptive of living foreign observers of our national life has said that it is the old towns of the Middle West that are more American and more touching to the historical imagination than the large cities. Two of these, Vincennes and Bardstown, today but quiet little towns, were once what Brogan describes as "centres of civilization, of learning, of religion, of commerce."[32] And in both Vincennes and Bardstown there was a cathedral and a college, staffed by bishops and priests from France, before the advancing frontier had hardly reached their doors. Here, then, was a significant stabilizing factor in the maturing process of the states of the Middle West.

When one turns from a consideration of the Catholic Church in the Spanish and French colonies of North America to the English settlements along the Atlantic coast, he enters a different world. After Henry VIII's break with Rome, and the subsequent Protestantizing of England under Elizabeth, the Catholic Church was outlawed and its adherents proscribed. Every outlet for Catholic life and thought was cut off, and by the opening of the seventeenth century the official policy of hostility to all things Catholic had come to embrace the great majority of Englishmen. In the change that transformed the mind of Elizabethan England it was Spain, as the chief Catholic power, that became, next to the papacy, the principal object of execration. The serious theological differences that divided the Protestant clergy were laid aside when matters related to Catholicism and Spain, for there Anglican and Puritan alike found a congenial meeting ground. The preachers were vehement in their attacks on Spain as a menace to the future of Protestantism in both Europe and the New World, and in a day when the ministers of religion were among the most articulate molders of public opinion these attacks proved highly effective. Sir Francis Drake, for example, had been schooled along these lines and when he set sail in November, 1577, for the voyage that carried him around the world he had an ample supply of religious literature aboard for his crew, among which anti-Catholic items like John Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* occupied a prominent place. No matter how dastardly Drake's plunderings of Spanish towns and property might be, they won the plaudits of the English clergy who, as it has been said, "were ever ready to glorify a seaman if he smote the Spanish papists hip and thigh."[33]

That there was a deep religious motivation behind the founding of the English colonies in North America is, of course, altogether true. The desire of the Puritans to escape from Anglican ritual, the intention of Anglicans to convert the Indians, and the hope of Quakers to find a peaceful haven in the new world—all were intermingled with the congeries of motives—lofty and base—that set in motion the English migration across the sea. In all of this the Catholics figured in a negative way, that is, for the English Protestants to put as great a distance as possible between themselves and the seats of Catholic power, and to strengthen the new world Canaan against the expanding empire of the Philistines of Spain. In that sense the Catholics entered strongly into the ideology of the English colonists. It was a theme on which the Protestant clergy knew no rest, and as Wright says, "With such conviction did they preach this doctrine that Englishmen at length accepted it as their imperial destiny."[34]

---

[32] D. W. Brogan, *The American Character* (New York, 1944), p. 12.

[33] Louis B. Wright, *Religion and Empire. The Alliance bewteen Piety and Commerce in English Expansion, 1558-1625* (Chapel Hill, 1943), p. 18.

Once the English had established themselves in North America they were entirely consistent in pursuing toward the Catholic Church the prejudice that they had brought with them from the mother country. So much was this the case that, with two major exceptions, one may almost assert that the Catholics had no history in the thirteen colonies. The two exceptions were Maryland and Pennsylvania, with one brief interval in New York. Otherwise from Massachusetts Bay to Georgia the climate of opinion, the laws, the system of education, the influence of the governing and clerical classes, and the books and literature of the years from 1607 to 1776 were so thoroughly imbued with enmity toward the Catholic religion that it is exceedingly rare for the historian of these colonies to find even the trace of a Catholic name. It constitutes a dreary chapter for the historian of colonial Catholicism, but it simplifies his task since his responsibility is largely confined to Maryland and Pennsylvania.

As the penal code tightened its hold about the lives of the English Catholics in the last years of Elizabeth, several furtive projects were set on foot to find a haven for the Catholics abroad. But these attempts met with no success and it remained for a convert member of the gentry to offer the first viable plan to the oppressed Catholics for a home in the new world. That man was George Calvert, the first Baron of Baltimore, to whom Maryland owed its origins. Calvert was a man of real although not striking abilities. He was honorable and benevolent by nature, had a good eye for business, and the strength of his character may be measured by the fact that when he became convinced in 1624 of the truth of the Catholic faith he did not hesitate to resign his secretaryship of state and surrender his seat in parliament to follow his religious convictions. Calvert had enjoyed high favor with King James I, and even his change of religion did not cause him to lose entirely the advantageous position which his winning personality and social standing had earned him. His conversion to Catholicism, however, focused his attention on the meanness of life to which the penal laws had reduced the Catholics, and he determined to employ his wealth and prestige in their behalf. Calvert's first attempt of 1627 to establish a colony in Newfoundland was wrecked by attacks from the French and the severity of the climate, and in 1629 he went to Virginia, of whose founding company he had been a member, in the hope of better fortune. But he was quickly disabused of the notion after being informed that Catholics were not welcome in Virginia. It was then that he decided to ask Charles I, the son and successor of his old patron, to grant a charter for a colony north of Virginia.

---

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 114.

The first Baron Baltimore was an enterprising man, and the commercial aspects of his American colony were never absent from his thoughts. But as Andrews remarks, "He was under the impelling influences of motives and obligations that were more imperative than those of a mere colonizer—among which was the sacred duty of finding a refuge for his Roman Catholic brethren . . ."[35] George Calvert himself died on April 15, 1632, just two months before the charter of Maryland was issued. The project then devolved upon his son, Cecilius, who like his father was anxious to draw to the undertaking the support of Protestants as well as Catholics. Loyal Catholic that he was, the second Baron Baltimore, nonetheless, saw no reason why men of different religious faiths could not join in a business of this kind if all practiced moderation and good will. Even if he had not been sincerely of this belief, and there is no evidence to doubt it, he was too much of a realist to think in terms of an exclusively Catholic colony. For that reason he raised no theological questions when the charter empowered him as proprietor to erect churches "to be dedicated and consecrated according to the Ecclesiastical Laws of our Kingdom of England . . ."[36]

---

[35] Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History* (New Haven, 1936), II, 279. The Beards were less than just in saying, "From first to last the Maryland colony was viewed by the Baltimores largely as an economic venture . . ." (*Ibid.,* I, 60).

Yet it was clear from the outset that Maryland was to be a colony where all Christians would find peace of conscience. Ten days before the colonists sailed in late November, 1633, the proprietor wrote out for his deputies a set of instructions by which he hoped to establish that as a permanent policy. He urged the leaders of the expedition to have all Catholic religious services conducted as privately as possible, both on board ship and on land, and to instruct the Catholics to be silent on occasions when religion was discussed, and he added, "that the said Governor and Commissioners treate the Protestants with as much mildness and favor as Justice will permit."[37] It was an act of expediency, true, but it was just as obviously an act of fairness and toleration unique at that time. Thus two years before Roger Williams fled before the Puritan wrath of Massachusetts Bay to establish religious tolerance in Rhode Island, Baltimore had laid the groundwork for such a policy in Maryland. For the first time in history there was a real prospect for a duly constituted government under which all Christians would possess equal rights, where all churches would be tolerated, and where none would be established. Such, in fact, Maryland did become, for to the "land of sanctuary" came Puritans fleeing persecution in Virginia and Anglicans escaping from the same threat in Massachusetts. As Winsor remarked, "It is the imperishable glory of Lord Baltimore and of the State."[38]

---

[36] Francis Newton Thorpe (Ed.), *The Federal and State Constitutions* (Washington, 1909), III, 1679.

[37] Clayton Colman Hall (Ed.), *Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684* (New York, 1910), p. 16.

[38] Justin Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America* (Boston, 1884), III, 530. Williams gave religious liberty to Jews and Catholics, as well as to Protestant Christians, although there is no record of a Catholic ever having been in Rhode Island during the colonial period. In Maryland the formal grant of religious toleration was restricted to Christians, and when a Jew by the name of Jacob Lumbrozo appeared about 1658 he encountered initial difficulties. But these were overcome and Lumbrozo settled down

After some delay caused by minor mishaps the *Ark* finally put to sea on Nov. 22, 1633, and was later joined at Barbados by the *Dove*. On board the *Ark* were Fathers Andrew White and John Altham, two English Jesuits, who managed somehow, like the Catholic laymen in the party, to set off without taking the customary oath that would have involved the denial of their religious faith. In all there were between 200 and 300 persons, with the Catholics led by Leonard Calvert, brother of the proprietor, the two Jesuit priests and two lay brothers, sixteen gentlemen adventurers with their wives, children, and servants, and a number of Catholic yeoman farmers and laborers. The remainder of the passengers on the *Ark* and the *Dove*, a numerical majority, were members of the Church of England. On March 24, 1634, the colonists landed on an island in Chesapeake Bay which they called St. Clement's and here Father White offered the first Mass for the Catholics. Some weeks later he wrote:

> After we had completed the sacrifice, we took upon our shoulders a great cross, which we had hewn out of a tree, and advancing in order to the appointed place, with the assistance of the Governor and his associates and the other Catholics, we erected a trophy to Christ the Saviour, humbly reciting, on our bended knees, the Litanies of the Sacred Cross, with great emotion.[39]

Meanwhile the Protestants held their own religious service. Thus was there inaugurated the only experiment in England's colonies of having Catholics and Protestants live side by side on terms of equality and toleration. "In that respect," says Andrews, "the settlement of Maryland holds a unique place in the history of English colonization."[40]

During the early years there was relative peace on the score of religion as the colonists went about the business of laying out their plantations and establishing their homes. In fact, there were

---

to a peaceful existence and was found serving on a jury in 1664. Cf. William T. Russell, *Maryland. The Land of Sanctuary* (Baltimore, 1907), pp. 271-74.

[39] E. A. Dalrymple (Ed.), *Narrative of a Voyage to Maryland by Father Andrew White, S.J., An Account of the Colony of the Lord Baron of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1874), p. 33.

[40] Andrews, *op. cit.*, II, 291.

even some conversions among the Protestant settlers to the Catholic faith. Up to the time of their report for 1638 the Jesuits had not been permitted by the government to open a mission among the neighboring Indians for fear that their lives might be endangered, but they had succeeded in buying off several Catholics in Virginia who had sold themselves into bondage. "As for the Catholics," said the *Annual Letter* for that year, "the attendance on the sacraments here is so large, that it is not greater among the Europeans, in proportion to the number of Catholics."[41] From the outset the Jesuits were dependent entirely upon their own resources, with no financial assistance from the colonial government, and as a consequence they, too, took up farms and began the cultivation of the land. The necessity of providing for their own living distracted the missionaries from their principal business as ministers of religion, and the further fact that the colony had no money but used payments in kind—after a time, largely tobacco—compelled the Jesuits to go about farming and bartering goods like any one else. These worldly pursuits made them subject to criticism, but they were left with no alternative if they were to sustain themselves.

The favorable auspices under which the colony had been begun were not, however, to endure. The chief source of trouble arose from William Claiborne of Virginia whose deep hatred of Catholics made him resentful of their proximity in Maryland, and who likewise harbored a personal grudge against the Calverts for their claim to Kent Island on which he had a plantation. As the Puritans became stronger in England and the shadow of civil war between King Charles I and parliament approached, Claiborne and his kind grew bolder. The fact that Baron Baltimore had permitted several hundred Puritans, unwelcome in Virginia, to cross over into Maryland in 1648, added a further complication, since the newcomers soon showed how little they appreciated the proprietor's hospitality by making common cause with Claiborne. The fact that there was a certain amount of traffic between Maryland and Virginia, and that the Jesuits had made a few converts from the latter colony aroused Virginia's anti-Catholic instincts and in

---

[41] Dalrymple, *op cit.*, p. 60.

March, 1642, the colonial assembly passed a law forbidding Catholics and priests to enter Virginia.

In August, 1642, Charles I raised his standard at Nottingham against the adherents of parliament and with that the civil war began. The suspicions concerning the king's Catholic sympathies led to renewed persecution in England and in 1641-42 eleven priests were put to death. It was a time of increased stress for Catholics on both sides of the Atlantic, for the admixture of Anglicans, Catholics, and Puritans in Maryland offered a fertile soil in which to sow the heightened religious frictions of the mother country. What the Maryland Protestants particularly resented—apart from their traditional dislike of Catholicism—was the fact that most of the leading offices were in the hands of Catholics and that the Jesuits were allowed to evangelize the Indians and to minister openly to the white settlers. Where fact to prove their charges was missing, rumor supplied, and it was at this time that there rose to the surface a campaign of suspicion against the Catholics that at intervals was to bedevil their lives to the Revolution. It became a constantly recurring phenomenon in colonial life, and a century later the Catholics of Pennsylvania were the victims of a "popish plot" during the French and Indian War.[42]

It was against a background of this kind that Baron Baltimore sought to save the internal peace of his colony by drafting and sending to the assembly the famous Act of Toleration of April, 1649. In that measure, passed by a body composed of both Protestants and Catholics, blasphemy and the calling of opprobrious religious names were made punishable offenses. The most important clause of the act read as follows:

> And whereas the inforceing of the conscience in matters of Religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous Consequence in those commonwealthes where it hath been practised . . . Be it Therefore . . . enacted . . . that noe person or persons whatsoever within this Province . . . professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth bee any

---

[42] "Few colonies suffered more from innuendo and whispering manoeuvres than did Maryland. . . . It was the religious condition in the colony that in large part was responsible for the form these rumors took." Andrews, *op. cit.*, II, 309-10.

> waies troubled, Molested or discountenanced for or in respect of his or her religion nor in the free exercise thereof. . . .[43]

This very liberal law for so early a date introduced, however, nothing essentially new into Maryland, for there had been toleration of all Christians since Cecilius Calvert had incorporated that principle into his instructions of 1633, a principle that was confirmed in 1648 when William Stone, the first Protestant governor, took his oath of office. The religious strife had, indeed, called the measure forth, but that fact in no way lessens the significance or value of the act, coming as it did at a time when the religious enactments of Maryland's sister colonies were showing an increasingly intolerant spirit.[44]

This memorable action of Baron Baltimore's government, however, proved vain and in the ensuing struggle the Puritan element overthrew the proprietor's regime whereupon the assembly of October, 1654, repealed the Act of Toleration and outlawed the Catholics. That they fully intended to erect a Puritan commonwealth along the lines of Massachusetts Bay was apparent, and once in power they wreaked a terrible vengeance on the Catholics by condemning ten of them to death, four of whom were executed, plundering the houses and estates of the Jesuits, and forcing the priests to flee in disguise into Virginia. The *Annual Letter* for 1656 described the fate of the missionaries when it said:

> With almost the entire loss of their property, private and domestic, together with great peril of life, they were secretly carried into Virginia; and in the greatest want of necessaries, scarcely, and with difficulty, do they sustain life. They live in a mean hut, low and depressed, not much unlike a cistern, or even a tomb, in which that great defender of the faith, St. Athanasius, lay concealed for many years.[45]

---

[43] William Hand Browne (Ed.), *Archives of Maryland. Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland, January 1637/38-September 1664* (Baltimore, 1883), I, 264, An Act concerning Religion, April 21, 1649.

[44] Virginia's law against Catholics in March, 1642 (William Waller Hening [Ed.], *The Statutes at Large; Being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia* [Richmond, 1809], I, 268-69), was followed five years later by a more stringent measure passed by Massachusetts Bay in May, 1647, as the result of a ridiculous scare about Catholic priests in the colony. Cf. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff (Ed.), *Records of the Government and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England* (Boston, 1854), III, 112.

[45] Dalrymple, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

Baltimore regained control of the government in 1657, but even then the proprietor's magnanimous pardon of all past wrongs and his plea for a renewal of the principle of religious toleration had little success in appeasing the Puritans. For the next thirty years they continued to make as much trouble as they could, with the Anglicans abetting them in a more moderate way. During these years the Catholic proprietor felt compelled to resort to severe punishments for infractions of the law, but only in the most extreme and obdurate cases were they actually carried out. Baltimore was a truly benevolent man, and it has rightly been said that "few appealed to his clemency without relief and few confessed their offenses without receiving forgiveness and a more or less complete pardon."[46]

It was the so-called "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 in England which encompassed the downfall of James II that spelled the doom of the Catholic Calverts in Maryland. The long agitation of the Protestant colonists to be rid of proprietary rule succeeded in June, 1691, when Baltimore lost his proprietary rights and Maryland became a royal colony. The chain of events unloosed in England by the accession of William and Mary included a new law passed by parliament in 1700 which incapacitated Catholics for inheriting and purchasing property, made priests subject to imprisonment for life, and offered a reward of 100 pounds to any informer who secured the conviction of a priest for saying Mass. The major casualty of this legislation was Benedict Leonard Calvert, son and heir to the third Baron Baltimore. In the hope of regaining his family's proprietary rights in Maryland, young Calvert publicly apostatized from the Catholic Church in January, 1713. After his death two years later the family was restored to its rights in the colony under his son Charles, the fifth Baron Baltimore, who had been raised a Protestant.

The anti-Catholic legislation of the mother country soon had its counterpart in Maryland where in 1692 the Church of England was established by law and the Catholics were compelled to pay taxes for its support. At the same time the English acts of toleration were extended to the Protestant dissenters but the Catholics were excluded from these benefits. The capital was moved from St.

---

[46] Andrews, *op. cit.*, II, 352.

Mary's, the center of Catholic strength, to Annapolis, and the chapel at the former settlement was locked by order of the governor. In October, 1704, an act of the assembly forbade any Catholic religious services within the colony, as it likewise forbade priests to exercise any of their ministerial functions or Catholic parents to send their children outside Maryland for religious instruction. Fortunately, this measure was mitigated by the intervention of Queen Anne and in 1707 permission was given to Catholics for religious services in private homes. It was in this fashion that they were forced to worship until the Revolution. Since this concession was granted to those subjects of Her Majesty who were, as it was stated, "behaving themselves peaceably and quietly,"[47] it says much for the spirit in which the Catholics suffered their many provocations. Civil disabilities followed in a similar vein wth office-holding barred to them and the complete disfranchisement voted in 1718 cut the Catholics off from all participation in the public life of the colony until 1776.

The exceedingly harsh penal code of the early eighteenth century affected only a small minority, for the census taken by the sheriffs of the counties in 1708 revealed only 2,974 Catholics out of a total population of 33,833, with the great majority of these concentrated in St. Mary's, Charles, and Prince George's Counties. Yet among this minority there were a number of well-to-do plantation owners like Charles Carroll, who had arrived in October, 1688, as attorney general. Carroll had succeeded, in spite of all obstacles, in firmly establishing himself, and by his bold enunciations of Catholic rights he made life thoroughly uncomfortable at times for the Protestant officialdom. Families like the Carrols, the Darnalls, and the Brookes, who remained steadfast in their religious faith, could afford to maintain chapels in their manor houses. Here the priests found hospitality and the facilities for saying Mass, as well as a place to catechize the young and administer the sacraments to these families and their large retinues of tenants, servants, and slaves. Moreover, their wealth permitted them to send their children abroad to be educated in schools like the College of Saint Omer near Calais where youngsters like Charles Carroll, the future signer of the Declaration of Independence, and his distant cousin, John Carroll, the future Archbishop of Baltimore, received their religious training under the Jesuits. In this way the sons of the Maryland Catholic gentry acquired an education that was as good as or better than that of their contemporaries at home.

---

[47] Browne, *op. cit.*, XXVII, 147, act of the Maryland General Assembly, April 15, 1707. Remarking the small number of Catholics in Maryland, Sanford H. Cobb said, "In the face of such a fact, and in face of the still more remarkable fact that, during the half century in which the Romanists governed Maryland, they were not guilty of a single act of religious oppression, the legislation against them was specially unwarranted and base." *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America* (New York, 1902), p. 451.

(To be continued)

John Tracy Ellis

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE COUNCILS OF BALTIMORE AND THE CATHOLIC PRESS

Since the year 1920, when His Excellency the Most Reverend Bishop William T. Russell was the episcopal chairman of the press department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, some period within each year has been set aside by the ecclesiastical authorities in this country to focus the attention of our Catholics upon the Catholic press. For many years this period has been the month of February, the month that begins three days after the feast of St. Francis de Sales, the patron of Catholic writers. The main objective of this Catholic Press Month has been and still is to induce Catholics to increase their support of Catholic publications.

The efforts of our American Bishops in behalf of Catholic publications, particularly Catholic periodicals, have a long and very interesting history. The action taken in 1920 was certainly inspired, to some extent at least, by the teachings and recommendations set forth in the American Bishops' National Pastoral Letter of 1919, the first they issued through the then newly organized NCWC. What this letter had to say on the subject of Catholic publications, particularly those of the periodical variety, was in great measure influenced by the pertinent teachings of the second and the third Plenary Councils of Baltimore, and by the contents of the Pastoral Letters issued by the Fathers of these two Plenary Councils. These sources, in their turn, were obviously influenced by previous declarations of the American Bishops in the various Provincial Councils of Baltimore. What these Bishops have had to say about the books and other publications offered to their people casts valuable light on the real meaning of Catholic Press Month in our own time.

A conference of the American Bishops held in 1810 issued certain "articles of discipline" for the guidance of the Catholics of this country. One of these articles, the only one having to do with a Catholic press, directs writers of manuals of prayers and of other books of piety to use the exact text of the "Doway Bible" in their compositions.[1]

---

[1] Cf. *Concilia provincialia Baltimori habita ab anno 1829 usque ad annum 1840* (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1842), p. 22; and Guilday, *A History of*

The First Provincial Council of Baltimore, held in October, 1829, devoted two of its decrees to the Catholic Press. In the first of these, the assembled Bishops took cognizance of the fact that there were frequently found, in books used widely in the schools, many assertions which contradicted the principles of the Catholic faith, explained Catholic dogmas inaccurately, and perverted the truth of history. The Bishops deplored the harm done to students by the reading of such books. They stated that zeal for religion, the right education of youth, and the good name of the nation itself all demanded that some action be taken against this evil. And, in order that such a remedy might be made available, they decreed that school texts entirely free of error, books in which nothing that might lead to hatred of or distaste for the Catholic religion should be published. These books were to be approved by the judgment of the Bishops.[2]

The other decree ordered the establishment of a Society for the dissemination of Catholic books, an organization of which the members were to be the prelates of the Baltimore Province and others whom they wished to associate with themselves in this work. The Fathers of the Council declared that, in taking this action, they were guided by the advice given by the late Pope Leo XII to the Archbishop of Baltimore.[3]

The Council of 1829 issued two pastoral letters, one directed to the laity, and the other to the clergy. The former is quite important as an indication of the Bishops' attitude towards the Catholic periodical press in those early days.

> Amongst the various misfortunes to which we have been exposed, one of the greatest is misrepresentation of the tenets, the principles and the practices of our church. This is not the place to account for the origin and continuance of this evil; we merely remind you of the melancholy fact . . . Repetition has given to those statements a semblance of evidence; and groundless assertions remaining almost uncontradicted, wear the appearance of admitted and irrefragable truth. It is true, that during some years past, an effort has been made to uphold a periodical publication in the south, which has refuted some of those allegations; but we say with regret that it has been permitted to lan-

---

the Councils of Baltimore: 1791-1884 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932), p. 74.

[2] Cf. *Concilia provincialia*, p. 78.

[3] Cf. *ibid.*

> guish for want of ordinary support, and must, we are informed, be discontinued, unless it receives your more extended patronage. Other publications for similar objects have lately been established in Boston and Hartford. We would advise you to encourage well-conducted works of this description. If you look around and see how many such are maintained, for their own purposes, by our separated brethren, it will indeed be a matter of reproach should we not uphold at least a few of our own.[4]

The Council then goes on to explain at some length the subject of school texts, which it had already treated in its decrees. Then, after an eloquent and beautiful paragraph on the dignity and the utility of the Scriptures, it goes on to rule about the use of translations of the Bible and of biblical texts.

> We therefore earnestly caution you against the indiscriminate use of unauthorized versions, for unfortunately many of those which are placed within your reach are extremely erroneous and defective. The Doway translation from the vulgate of the Old Testament, together with the Remish translation of the New Testament, are our best English versions; but as some printers have undertaken in these States, by their own authority, without our sanction, to print and publish editions which have not been submitted to our examination, we cannot hold ourselves responsible for the correctness of such copies. We trust that henceforth it will be otherwise. We would also desire to correct that irregularity by which prayer books and other works of devotion and instruction are produced from the press, in several instances, without authority or correction: some of the books thus published are rather occasions of scandal than of edification. We would entreat of you not to encourage such proceedings.[5]

Four years later the Second Provincial Council of Baltimore again appealed for support of Catholic periodical literature. It addressed these counsels to the Catholic laity.

> Be constant at preaching and the other instruction in your churches; sustain, as far as your means will permit, those publications, whether periodical or otherwise, which are calculated to explain our doctrines, to protect our feelings, and to increase our devotion. We rejoice to find that their number is rapidly increasing, and we trust to your zeal, your

---

[4] Guilday, *The National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy: 1792-1919* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1954), pp. 27 f.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

> piety and your liberality, to encourage their publishers by your patronage, and to profit yourselves by their perusal.[6]

In 1833 the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore was obliged to take cognizance of the rabid antagonism towards and misrepresentation of the Catholic Church then prevalent in the United States. The Third Provincial Council, which assembled four years later, had the melancholy duty to remind the Catholics of our country of the shameful burning of the Ursaline Convent in Charlestown, Massachusetts, on Aug. 11, 1834, an outrage which was a logical consequence of the unbridled campaign of calumny and hatred deplored by the previous assemblies of American Bishops. The Council of 1837, after adverting to the attacks against the Church then prevalent in the non-Catholic religious press and in much of the public periodical literature, had this to say about Catholic reading:

> Within a few years, however, some publishers have put forth a number of books containing a correct exposition of our doctrines and the defence of our tenets; though we regret that in some instances, either acting from their own views or having consulted with persons not sufficiently qualified to advise them, they have occasionally exhibited a want of judgment in their selection: We find that amongst you the spirit of encouraging their efforts has been daily becoming more strong, and we trust, that they will themselves feel it to be their duty, as it will be their interest henceforward to consult in the proper manner, with the ordinary ecclesiastical superior, before they undertake such publications.
>
> We feel disposed also to exhort you to sustain with better efforts those journals, which though not officially sanctioned by us, still are most useful to explain our tenets, to defend our rights and to vindicate our conduct. We regret to learn that in several instances those conducted under the eye of the ordinary ecclesiastical authority are continued only at a pecuniary sacrifice to their proprietors, and by the zealous and gratuitous exertions of their editors. We would impress upon you the necessity of exertion on your parts, to have them better sustained and their circulation extended as widely as possible.[7]

The Council of 1837 closed this section of its pastoral letter by informing the faithful of the establishment of a Society similar to or identical with the one mentioned in the decrees of the First Provincial Council. The Fifth Provincial Council, in 1843, approved the establishment of publishing houses in Baltimore and in Cincinnati, in which clerics designated by the ordinary acted as advisers.

---

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 114 f.

These early Provincial Councils of Baltimore were, in general, content to praise and to recommend the Catholic periodicals of their time. They complained of and legislated against editions of Holy Scripture published without their approval by Catholics. They warned against unauthorized publication of "prayer books and other works of devotion and instruction." For Catholic periodical literature as such, however, they had nothing but good to say. The First Provincial Council lamented the lack of support given to Bishop England's *Miscellanea,* took cognizance of similar ventures started in New England, and advised their faithful "to encourage well-conducted works of this description." The Second Provincial Council rejoiced at the increasing number of worthy Catholic publications, including periodicals, and asked their people to support their publishers and to take advantage of the good contained in the publications themselves. Interestingly enough, the First Council saw the Catholic periodical press as valuable for correcting the then current misrepresentations of all things Catholic. The Second Council spoke of a literature "calculated to explain our doctrines, to protect our feelings, and to increase our devotion." The Third envisioned the Catholic periodical press as working "to explain our tenets, to defend our rights and to vindicate our conduct." The Third Provincial Council touched almost incidentally upon an aspect of the Catholic periodical press which was to be the subject of legislation and explanation of future American Councils when it praised the Catholic papers as "journals, which though not officially sanctioned by us, still are most useful."

In the decrees of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, held in October, 1866, an entire chapter is entitled "De Ephemeridibus." The Fathers of this Council were forced to deal with a problem which had not been treated in detail by any of their predecessors. Certain opponents of the Church, designated in the chapter as "maligni adversarii," were attributing to the Catholic religion itself or to ecclesiastical authority some judgments made by Catholic writers and editors in the public press. In order to obviate any such misunderstanding in the future, the Council wished "to make it known and manifest to all that no periodical is acknowledged as a Catholic periodical by us *(nullam a nobis Ephemeridem pro Cath-*

olicâ agnosci) which does not show the approbation of the Ordinary."[8]

The Fathers of this Second Plenary Council of Baltimore then set out to correct inaccurate notions about the relation of the Ordinary to even the truly Catholic papers and magazines published within his diocese. They insisted that even those papers or magazines which called themselves, and which the Bishop allowed to be called, "official organs" of the diocese could contain statements in no way attributable to the Ordinary himself. In clearing up this point, they gave us what still remains a most explicit and useful definition of ecclesiastical approbation of periodical literature available to us.

> The Fathers of this Plenary Council profess and declare that the approbation of the Ordinary, which is customarily (*de more*) given to Catholic periodicals means nothing else than that the Bishop judges that nothing is being set forth by the writers [of these periodicals] against faith and morals, that he has good reason to hope that nothing of the kind will be set forth in the future (*spem quoque bonam se habere nihil in posterum proferendum*), and that they are writers whose publications may be useful unto edification (*eosque esse redactores quorum scripta ad aedificationem utilia esse possint*): and [they profess and declare] that the Bishop neither can nor ought to answer or to be held responsible for all of the things which appear in such periodicals, but only for those things which, by virtue of his obligation to teach, to warn, to command, and to forbid, he publishes and which he himself signs with his own hand.[9]

The Fathers decreed that this same point should be brought out at greater length and in more detail in the Pastoral Letter they were going to direct to the faithful at the conclusion of this Council. As a matter of fact, however, the section of the Pastoral Letter of 1866 dealing with this subject is less valuable than the text of the decree itself, despite the fact that it is still quite helpful.

> We also wish to guard against the misapprehension, which frequently arises from the Bishop's name being connected with such papers

---

[8] *Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis II in Ecclesia Metropolitana Baltimorensi a die vii ad diem xxi Octobris A.D. MDCCCLXVI habiti et a Sede Apostolica recogniti Acta et Decreta* (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1894), p. 256.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 257.

> [Catholic papers, mostly of a religious character, bearing upon them the statement that they are the "organs" of the Bishop of the diocese in which they are published, and sometimes of other Bishops in whose diocese they circulate] in so far as they are recognized as "organs," that is, as mediums through which the Ordinary communicates with his diocesans. This circumstance gives no sanction to the articles which appear in such papers, other than they may derive from the name of the writer when given: still less does it identify the Bishop with the paper, so as to justify the conclusion that whatever appears in it has his sanction and authority. It merely designates the paper as one in which the Bishop will cause to be inserted such official documents as he, from time to time, may have to publish, and in regard to which it is obviously desirable that there should be some regular mode of communication.[10]

The 1866 Pastoral shows that even immediately after the end of the Civil War there were Catholics who were deeply and loudly dissatisfied with the condition of the contemporary Catholic periodicals. Indeed, it would appear that the Fathers of the Council themselves were not particularly proud of some of the products of their own press, since they blamed the shortcomings apparent in some Catholic papers on the lack of support of these periodicals by the Catholic public.

> We cheerfully acknowledge the services the Catholic Press has rendered to Religion, as also the disinterestedness with which, in most instances, it has been conducted, although yielding to publishers and editors a very insufficient return for their labors. We exhort the Catholic community to extend to these publications a more liberal support, in order that they may be enabled to become more worthy [of] the great cause they advocate.
>
> We remind them, that the power of the press is one of the most striking features of modern society; and that it is our duty to avail ourselves of this mode of making known the truths of our Religion, and removing the misapprehensions which so generally prevail in regard to them. If many of these papers are not all that we would wish them to be, it will be frequently found, that the real cause of their shortcomings is the insufficient support they receive from the Catholic Public. Supply and demand act and react on each other; and if in many instances the former produces the latter, in regard at least to Catholic publications, demand must precede supply.[11]

---

[10] Guilday, *The National Pastorals*, p. 214.

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 213 f.

This same Pastoral earnestly recommended the Catholic Publication Society, which it described as "lately established in the City of New York by a zealous and devoted clergyman." The Fathers expressed their hope that this organization would be "eminently effective in making known the truths of our Holy Religion, and dispelling the prejudices which are mainly owing to want of information on the part of so many of our fellow-citizens." They declared it "necessary that a generous co-operation be given, both by clergy and laity, to the undertaking, which is second to none in importance, among the subsidiary aids which the inventions of modern times supply to our Ministry for the diffusion of Catholic Truth."[12]

The Second Plenary Council concluded its chapter on periodicals with a citation from Pope Pius IX, deploring the harm caused by bad books and magazines and urging "men endowed with piety, talent, and sound doctrine" to bring about by their writings, under the direction of their bishops, the refutation of evil teachings and the explanation and defense of the Catholic faith. The Fathers of the Council made it clear that they desired this same benefit for their own flocks.[13]

Eighteen years later the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore included in their Decrees, under the title "De Doctrina Christiana," a chapter "De Libris et Ephemeridibus." Like their predecessors of 1866, the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council complained about the evil done by the press, and stigmatized the published material which, if not openly, at least by implication attacked religion and moral rectitude. They also followed the Fathers of 1866 in their positive reaction to the problem. They did not wish to content themselves with protests against evil literature. They intended to see to it that the tremendous power of the press, which was being exploited against Our Lord's cause, would be employed for the furtherance of His Church and of His teaching. In line with that intention they formulated and incorporated into their *Acta* what is probably the finest tribute ever paid to American Catholic writers as a body.

> Therefore we hold worthy of all praise those clerics and laymen who have struggled to defend and to extend Catholicism among us both

---

[12] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 214.

[13] Cf. *Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis II . . . Acta et Decreta*, pp. 258 f.

> by writing books and pamphlets and by publishing periodicals. The Fathers have decided that their great merits in the Church should not only be gratefully remembered in this great assembly, but that they should also, as is right, be proclaimed, commemorated, and openly praised. Their memory will be in benediction when they shall have rested from their pious labors and returned to the hands of God, from whom they received them, their talents that have gained great interest. May the number of those who are prepared to fight the good fight generously and with good heart not decrease, but grow from day to day.[14]

Besides commending the Catholic writers as a group, the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore also issued a stern warning against harmful periodicals which in one way or another claimed to be Catholic.

> While we commend Catholic periodicals, we also wish to warn the faithful that not all of those which claim to be Catholic are really so in reality. The writers in these periodicals glory in the Catholic name, but by their example and their writings they disgrace that name and hold it up to ridicule. They spread among the public their opinions which far too frequently are nothing but the teachings of unbelievers and purveyors of novelty about the origin of human society and the limits of civil power. Moreover, they either try in an insidious and fraudulent way and by honeyed words to subvert the authority of the Church or they openly oppose it. Only the periodical that presents and defends the doctrine of the Church, that tells about the progress of the Church at home and abroad, and that is prepared to obey ecclesiastical authority in all things should be considered a Catholic periodical.[15]

The Decrees of the Third Plenary Council then insist that the Bishop is not to be held responsible for all that is printed in his own diocesan paper, and they incorporate the passage from the Acta of the Second Plenary Council which explains this matter in detail. They also urge those Catholics who are placed in charge of the work of the Catholic periodical press to set an example to others "by their faith and their fidelity to duty, as well as in their lives and conduct."[16] Their own writings, and the articles written by others and printed in their papers, must measure up to the standards of Christian charity and modesty. In defending the Church and the faith against attacks and calumnies, the Catholic editors must not descend to the level of the Church's opponents. They are to refute the enemies of truth by the power of their arguments, rather than to indulge in offensive language. Ultimately, in this regard, they are bound to observe these same laws in legitimate controversies among Catholic writers themselves.

---

[14] *Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii A.D. MDCCCLXXXIV* (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1886), pp. 125 f.

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 126 f.

[16] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 127 f.

> If it be permissible to disagree with the opinions of some Catholic writer, let them express that disagreement, but only in a temperate manner and without bitterness. Among men of good will, Christian charity is quite consistent with differences of opinion.[17]

This chapter of the *Acta* of the Third Plenary Council ends with a stern warning to those writers who made trouble in the Church by trying to set Catholics against their Bishops. It stigmatizes those responsible for such offenses as "disturbers of the peace, in contempt of and hostile to ecclesiastical authority, and guilty of the gravest scandal."[18]

The Pastoral Letter issued by the Fathers of the 1884 Council resumed the teachings of that Council's Decrees on the Catholic Press in one short paragraph.

> Finally, Christian parents, let us beg your earnest consideration of this important truth, that upon you, singly and individually, must practically depend the solution of the question, whether or not the Catholic press is to accomplish the great work which Providence and the Church expect of it at this time. So frequently and so forcibly has the providential mission of the press been dwelt upon by Popes and prelates and distinguished Catholic writers, and so assiduously have their utterances been quoted and requoted everywhere, that no one certainly stands in need of arguments to be convinced of this truth. But all this will be only words in the air, unless it can be brought home to each parent and made practical in each household. If the head of each Catholic family will recognize it as his privilege and his duty to contribute towards supporting the Catholic press, by subscribing for one or more Catholic periodicals, and keeping himself well acquainted with the information they impart, then the Catholic press will be sure to attain to its rightful development and to accomplish its destined mission. But choose a journal that is thoroughly Catholic, instructive and edifying; not one that would be, while Catholic in name or pretense, uncatholic

---

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 128.

[18] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 129.

> in tone and spirit, disrespectful to constituted authority, or biting and uncharitable to Catholic brethren.[19]

The Fathers of the Third Plenary Council commended diocesan papers, but expressed the view that the Catholic cause would be better served by one Catholic periodical for each ecclesiastical province rather than by one for each diocese. They also hoped for the establishment of a Catholic daily paper.

> It is strongly to be hoped that in some one of our major cities there should be a daily paper which might equal the secular papers in resources, in the authority and talent of its writers, and in size. It is not necessary that it should bear a Catholic name. It would be enough if, over and above the late news and all the other features which are sought so avidly in other papers, it would, when the proper occasion presented itself, defend the Catholic religion against the attacks and lies of its enemies, explain the doctrine of the Church, and carefully keep away from the eyes of its readers everything scandalous and salacious.[20]

The *Acta* and the Pastoral Letters of the various Provincial and Plenary Councils of Baltimore spoke of the benefits emanating from the Catholic periodical press chiefly in terms of the defense of the Catholic faith and the accurate presentation of the Church's teachings. The Pastoral of 1919, the next one after that of 1884, pointed out the good done by this press in bringing out the Catholic point of view in the important issues affecting the welfare of the nation itself. It also expressed approval of Catholic journalism and the results it had achieved.

> The functions of the Catholic Press are of special value to the Church in our country. To widen the interest of our people by acquainting them with the progress of religion throughout the world, to correct false or misleading statements regarding our belief and practice, and, as occasion offers, to present our doctrine in popular form—these are among the excellent aims of Catholic journalism. As a means of forming sound public opinion it is indispensable. The vital issues affecting the nation's welfare usually turn upon moral principles. Sooner or later, discussion brings forward the question of right and wrong. The treatment of such subjects from the Catholic point of view is helpful to all our people. It enables them to look at current events and problems

---

[19] Guilday, *The National Pastorals,* p. 252.

[20] *Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii,* p. 126.

in the light of the experience which the Church has gathered through centuries, and it points the surest way to a solution that will advance our common interests.

The unselfish zeal displayed by Catholic journalists entitles them to a more active support than hitherto has been given. By its very nature the scope of their work is specialized; and, within the limitations thus imposed, they are doing what no other agency could accomplish or attempt, in behalf of our homes, societies and schools.[21]

What the various Provincial and Plenary Councils of Baltimore have decreed about Catholic writings, and especially about the Catholic periodical press, does not constitute any full treatise on the subject. Yet the directions they gave are still valid, and still highly important. The directors of publications which set out to advance the Catholic cause must still work under the guidance of and in strict obedience to the diocesan Bishops, the only divinely constituted doctrinal authorities in the Church. They must still work to defend the Church and its teachings, and, as occasion demands, to explain these teachings clearly and accurately. They are still bound by the obligations of charity even in the expression of legitimate differences of opinion.

The Catholic reading public is still obliged to refuse support to periodicals which falsely exploit the Catholicism of their publishers and writers to present views incompatible with the authoritative teaching of the Church. And, for the advance of the cause of Our Lord's Mystical Body in this world, they are still called upon to give more adequate support to truly Catholic publications.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

---

[21] Guilday, *The National Pastorals*, pp. 290 f.

Answers to Questions

OUR LADY'S VOW OF VIRGINITY

Question: Is the opinion that the Blessed Virgin made a vow of virginity merely a pious belief, which may or may not be held by Catholics?

Answer: There is no censure involved in denying a vow of virginity to the Blessed Virgin. Some Catholic exegetes have done so. However, the opinion that Mary did make such a vow is well founded in Sacred Scripture. In fact, it is the only satisfactory explanation of her statement to the angel: "How shall this happen, since I do not know man?"

It should be borne in mind that at the time of the Annunciation Mary was at least betrothed to Joseph, if not actually married to him. Exegetes are not agreed as to her actual status, but at least a betrothal must be admitted from the texts of both Matthew and Luke. This fact is of great significance for seizing the import of her question. The angel announced her coming motherhood, imposed the name of the child, and stated clearly that the child was the promised Messias. All these things Mary clearly understood. In view of her status—as at least a betrothed—she should not have raised a question concerning conjugal relations, for her situation guaranteed the propriety of the latter, surely in the near future. The fact that Mary posed the question indicates quite clearly the presence of something in her situation contrary to conjugal relations.

Moreover, the obstacle to which she alluded could not have been dependent on her will alone. If such were the case, she would have yielded to the divine announcement without question. Considering her intelligence, supernatural endowments, and submission, opposition on the part of Mary is inconceivable. The obstacle, therefore, involved also the divine will: Mary had made a pact with God concerning her virginity, and wished to know what God willed her to do regarding the pact. The reply of the angel, of course, indicated that the pact remained firm.

Exegetes use the term *votum* and *propositum* (resolution) at random when speaking of the pact of the Blessed Mother. A mere resolution, however, does not seem to suffice, for by its nature it is dependent on the human will alone. Thus, only a vow adequately explains the obstacle referred to by the Blessed Virgin.

MISSA PRO POPULO AND RELIGIOUS SUPERIORS

Question: Are local superiors bound to say Mass for their subjects if the community enjoys the privilege of exemption?

Answer: The Code is silent on the matter but authors commonly teach that there is no strict obligation incumbent upon religious superiors to offer Mass for their subjects. Lest the religious be in a less favorable condition than the rest of the faithful who share in the *pro populo* Mass of their bishop and pastor, the local superior ought in charity to offer and apply Mass occasionally, at least, for his subjects. Particular law and customs in some religious institutes actually provide that Mass be offered on certain days of the year for the community.

RELIGIOUS PROFESSION AND THE REMISSION OF TEMPORAL PUNISHMENT

Question: Are preachers justified in comparing religious profession to the sacrament of baptism and to martyrdom with regard to its expiatory effects?

Answer: The teaching that religious profession is equal in expiatory value to baptism and martyrdom is a teaching commonly found among theologians and spiritual writers. It is not clear from the writings of St. Thomas whether he held this teaching as certain or not. At least it was his opinion that by entering the religious state one receives the same grace as by being baptized. St. Robert Bellarmine does not place the taking of vows on an equal plane with baptism. He claims it is only a pious belief and not certain that the assumption of the religious life effects a complete condonation of temporal punishment. Suarez, likewise, is not certain of this opinion, but admits the probability of it because of the number of great theologians who see in the act of assuming the religious state—or of the actual profession—perfect self-surrender, a work of such merit as to wipe out all temporal punishment.

Hence, one may conclude that it is highly probable that the religious profession, because of the sublime act of self-surrender which it entails, obtains the perfect remission of all temporal punishment due to sin, provided the religious is in the state of grace and free from attachment to sin. (Cf. *Review for Religious,* III, pp. 402-409.)

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, O.CARM.

AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH OVER THE UNBAPTIZED

Question: Does the Catholic Church possess any authority over unbaptized persons?

Answer: To answer this question correctly we must distinguish the Church's authority into two types—authority to teach (*potestas docendi*) and authority to legislate (*potestas regendi*). This latter type of authority extends only over those who have been baptized, since only by Baptism is a person made a member of the Church and subject to its laws (Cf. *DB* 864). But the authority to teach doctrines of faith and morals, granted by the Son of God, extends over all human beings, baptized and unbaptized alike. For Our Lord commissioned the apostles and their successors to preach the Gospel to *every* creature (*Mark* 16:16). Corresponding to this right of the Church to teach all men in the field of religious truth is an obligation on the part of all to hear and to accept the teachings of the Church.

This teaching authority embraces the right to proclaim (even infallibly, if the required conditions are present) not only the truths of divine revelation, but also religious truths of the natural order, both speculative and practical. Accordingly, it includes the authority to interpret authentically (and even infallibly) the principles of the natural law, so that even the unbaptized are *per se* bound to accept this interpretation. Thus, all men are bound by divine precept to assent to the Church's declaration that contraception is a grave violation of the natural law. Of course, in practice the majority of the unbaptized are unaware of this obligation, and hence are subjectively guiltless in not accepting the Church's teaching authority. But a practical example that not infrequently occurs is the case of the catechumen, the unbaptized person preparing to become a Catholic. He is not yet bound by the laws of the Church, but he is bound to acquiesce to its teaching authority. Thus, if competent ecclesiastical authority declares that a certain book or show is dangerous to his spiritual welfare, he would be bound to accept this statement as true and consequently would ordinarily be bound to abstain from reading the book or seeing the show by virtue of the natural-law obligation to avoid occasions of sin, even though the Church as yet has no authority to *legislate* against his reading the book or attending the show. From this, it is evident that we should not say without qualification that the Catholic Church possesses no authority over the unbaptized.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF SACRAMENTS TO A DYING SCHISMATIC

Question: In my parochial ministrations in a public hospital I frequently meet Oriental schismatics who have no priest of their own rite, and who ask me to give them the sacraments. What may I, a Catholic priest, do for such persons, who are often very devout, especially when they are in danger of death?

Answer: The Code of Canon Law explicitly states that the sacraments may not be given to schismatics, even though they are in good faith, unless they retract their errors (Can. 731, §2). However, a certain measure of leniency can be permitted in the interpretation of this ruling. Thus, I believe that if an Oriental schismatic in danger of death sincerely promises a Catholic priest that in the event of recovery he will make an honest and thorough examination of the claims of the Catholic Church, this may be regarded as a sufficient retractation. Regatillo-Zalba are even more generous, allowing a priest to confer Extreme Unction (and logically Penance also) on schismatics in danger of death "if they cannot be disturbed in their good faith with any hope of success, and are otherwise sorry for their sins and prepared to use the divinely established means necessary for salvation" (*Theologiae moralis summa* [Madrid, 1954], III, n. 652). When schismatics are dying unconscious they may be given (conditionally) Penance and Extreme Unction, according to the common teaching of theologians. But hardly ever can schismatics be given the Holy Eucharist unless they explicitly acknowledge the Catholic Church, because of the grave danger of scandal and the encouragement of indifferentism (Cf. Prah, *Communication of Catholics in non-Catholic Religious Rites* [Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1956], pp. 77-86).

MULTIPLICITY OF STIPENDS ON EASTER SUNDAY

Question: May a priest take three stipends for three Masses on Easter Sunday, by analogy with Christmas?

Answer: The Church law grants no permission for a priest to take more than one stipend on Easter Sunday, as is granted for Christmas; hence, the general law must be observed, that the priest may celebrate only one Mass for a stipend, apart from an extrinsic title (Can. 824, §2). However, I believe that by a *fictio juris,* in the observance of the new Holy Week liturgy, a priest might lawfully accept two stipends for two Masses on Easter Sunday. The case is that of a priest who officiates at the Vigil service on Holy Saturday night at a time when the Mass (at least the greater part) is actually celebrated after midnight. It would seem that by a fiction of law as far as the priest is concerned, the Mass is regarded as being celebrated on Saturday, since the Church allows the officiating priest to celebrate another Mass later in the day (even *devotionis causa*). Hence, I believe that the priest placed in this circumstance could take a stipend for the midnight Mass and another stipend for the Mass later in the day. If he is a pastor, bound to celebrate Mass on Easter Sunday *pro populo,* he could fulfil this obligation by the later Mass and take a stipend for the Vigil Mass (Cf. *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXXXIV, 5 [May 1956], 347).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Analecta

The months before Christmas were ones in which the various utterances of the Holy Father were colored by the serious world situation. Speaking to the world by radio on November 10 His Holiness appealed for an end to repressions, to plans for war, and to power politics among the nations of the world. He told of his anguish at the word of the sufferings of the Hungarian people and of his sorrow at the sight of the diminishing hope for peace and justice among the nations of the world. He then begged the peoples of the world to restore the ways of peace, to reinforce the union of those in the world who long for it, and to restore trust to those who have lost it. "May the name of God," he said, "as a synonym of peace and freedom, be the standard of men of good-will, the bond of peoples and nations, and the sign by which brothers and collaborators in the work of common salvation will recognize one another."

Twice in this period the Holy Father appealed to the youth of the world to bring help to society. On November 22 he addressed a group of the European Campaign for Youth and asked that they work to "Overcome all the obstacles which egoism, indifference and hostility are still placing between European nations." His hopes for the future of youth, however, were optimistic and he predicted for them a future filled with "unlimited prospects and astonishing results." On the occasion of another talk to youth, namely, a message to the Third General Assembly of the International Federation of Catholic Youth on December 13, in Rome, the Pope said that youths should strive to bring peace to the world by overcoming obstacles dividing nations. He emphasized the fact that their union offers a powerful means of healing the wounds of war as well as pacifying and reconciling the peoples of the world. Since the theme of the assembly was education towards the spiritual life, and its relation to professional life and modern culture, the Pope asked them to aim after an exact faithfulness to the spiritual life. In this way, he said, they will be enabled to carry out a fruitful apostolate. A similar theme, unity between nations, was the Pope's topic in an address on December 11 to the members of the executive council of the International Federation of Catholic Men. He called upon the men to coordinate their activities with other forms of the apostolate and to remain close to ecclesiastical authority in their efforts. The bonds of unity among men cannot be made outside of the Church, he said, and consequently, Catholic men's organizations must work for harmonious relations between the Church and the modern world.

On December 3, the Holy Father spoke by radio to the throng assembled for the closing ceremonies of the Second National Eucharistic Congress of the Philippine Islands. He urged the people to resist the forces of godless materialism as well as the lure of a selfish, narrow nationalism. "Victory," he said, "for the divine and human values in the global struggle for men's souls is assured to those alone who are loyal to His cause and obedient to His commands."

The Pope spoke out in clear and direct terms on the menace of communism on November 19, to 5,000 workers from the city of Terni, Italy. The Pope said he is troubled by the fact that communism still makes inroads among Italian workers even though it has been amply proven to be evil. In the same talk he tried to relieve the fears of the workers concerning automation as a serious future source of unemployment.

Praising the science of anatomy as "one of the most noble and precious branches of human knowledge," the Holy Father told a group of doctors from the Italian Society of Anatomy on November 15, that it is impossible to understand life without taking into account God and the human soul. Science, he said, must integrate the study of man's body with that of his soul and view the latter in the general plan of the Creator Himself. The doctor, he continued, studies the human organism closely and should, therefore, remain in closer contact with the Source of Life than others.

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, O.CARM.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

BEYOND THE DREAMS OF AVARICE. By Russell Kirk. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1956. Pp. x+339. $4.50.

James Pike once wrote that "the conservative who knows the real basis of his conserving is the true radical." It is perhaps in this sense that one can refer to a writer who in recent years has given a new respectability to conservatism, Mr. Russell Kirk, a radical concerned with the real roots of the conservative tradition.

Mr. Kirk derives the colorful title of this collection of essays from another famous conservative, Samuel Johnson, who considered such dreams of avarice "wild and guilty fantasies."

The author, describing himself modestly as a social critic, continues his highly articulate justification of conservatism in defense of what Santayana referred to rather gloomily as "a dispossessed and forlorn orthodoxy" that "cannot be silenced."

The book is divided into two sections: *American Observations,* consisting of studies in education, academic freedom, censorship, and liberalism; and *Notes from Abroad,* an interesting if somewhat irrelevant series on such diverse subjects as the Fabians, utopias, and English letters. The reviewer hastens to add, however, that the perceptive character of the first part of the volume is more than enough to justify a careful reading.

In general, Mr. Kirk assails, not so much the liberal dogmas and pretensions, but the assumptions of what he tartly calls a "defecated rationality." He cites, for example, the talented Lionel Trilling, who has stated that he uses the term "liberal" and "intellectual" almost synonymously. Since Mr. Kirk has a high respect for the genuine intellectual (he does not share the dislike for the term of Bertrand Russell who once stated that nobody would dare call him an intellectual in his presence!), he is understandably nettled at the liberal attempt to preempt the field of learning. He does not seem either to believe that an intellectual, to use the happy phrase of Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., is one who manages to read without moving his lips.

He resists too the "muddled neoterists" who would limit the title of intellectual to a "presumptuous caste" of progressivists made to the image and likeness of John Dewey. Mr. Kirk, incidentally, does not consider it a crime of *lèse majesté* to speak of the theories of the lamented *sahib* of the Instrumentalists with less than the accustomed reverence.

This, of course, bodes ill for our hapless author, for not only has he had the temerity to defend what Instrumentalism considers not only indefensible but unmentionable, but he would defend the God it humanizes, and reject the man it apotheosizes.

It is the Kirk thesis that true intellectual freedom must be in accord with the will of God; that privilege has an equivalent responsibility; and that much of the clamor for academic freedom is actually a desire on the part of some for academic power "to dominate the wills of their colleagues and to force the minds of their students into an ideology that they happen to fancy."

It hardly need be said that Mr. Kirk's words have been received, even among theists, with something less than undiluted enthusiasm; for it is a strange phenomenon of our time that the liberal who is professionally committed, as it were, to a wide tolerance of men and ideas, has also been known to exhibit upon occasion an unusual sensitivity when contradicted by less latitudinarian souls. This type of liberal feels that everybody should be heard except the man who feels that perhaps everybody is not worth hearing. The fault, of course, does not consist in maintaining that everyone should have the civic right to speak, but in the indifferentist assumption that all people, having spoken, have offered opinions of equal worth.

It is also conceivable that much of the dislike for Mr. Kirk's ideas is similar to the dislike of Oscar Wilde for arguments, which he once said were "always vulgar, and sometimes convincing." Mr. Kirk, though never vulgar, is often quite convincing.

Any discussion of the merits of conservatism eventually gets back to the never-ending quarrel concerning the meaning of the terms "liberal" and "conservative." Such a discussion seems to be a question of geography rather than ideology, since the terms indicate a general direction of thought orientation rather than a repertoire of specific beliefs. Mr. Kirk's contribution has been to examine the constructive role of a progressive conservatism, and it would indeed be difficult to find one who has done his job with such consummate skill.

If one were to find any fault with this splendid book, one might indicate a position of Mr. Kirk's that inadvertently puts him in the camp of "the enemy." In his defense of religion and religious values, he seems to consider religion in Toynbee's vague and unsatisfactory sense of "higher religions." Now Mr. Kirk laments a sectarianism which is "a congeries of jealous dissenting chapels," but he has not gone far enough. Although he realizes that indifferentism is a great sin of the liberal society, he does not seem to think religious egalitarianism indicative of the "defecated rationality" that he so condemns. One hopes that if Mr. Kirk does seriously entertain this "different-roads-to-the-same-place" idea (although he never employs this singularly infelicitous figure of speech), he might reflect that it is a divine prerogative to channel traffic to a single street.

Robert Paul Mohan, S.S.

Catholic Pioneers in West Africa. By Martin J. Bane, S.M.A. Dublin: Clonmore and Reynolds Ltd., 1956. Pp. 220. 18 shillings.

Although we know that the deeds and lives of missionaries are written in the Book of Life, we also know that the memory of man is very short. Consequently to give due honor to the missionaries' accomplishments, they must be preserved in the annals of history. The present book has recorded in part the history of Catholic Missions in West Africa. It is divided into two parts: Part One gives a brief sketch of mission history from the time of Pope Nicholas V (1447-55) to the time of Pope Pius IX (1846-78); Part Two describes the missionary activities of the Society of African Missions from their foundation to the present day.

The book begins with Henry the Navigator, Prince of Portugal, whose burning zeal for the spread of the church can be affirmed by the great confidence and power which the Popes placed before him. Within sixty years after Henry's death the son of the first Catholic Monarch of the Congo received consecration as the first West African to become a Bishop of the Church. The seventeenth century saw the foundation of many missions in San Salvador, Loanda, San Thome, and Lower Guinea. Franciscans, Jesuits, Dominicans, and Capuchins all played their part in attempting to bring Christ to the pagans of the Gold Coast. They struggled to keep the flame of faith alive in the eighteenth century. They found themselves faced with the gigantic task of demanding human rights and fighting the slave traffic. The first part of the book ends with the request of Pius IX asking Bishop Bresillac to form a society of priests who would devote themselves exclusively to the Negro African Missions. Thus on Dec. 8, 1856, the Society of African Missions was formed.

The second section of the book, dealing with the activities of Bresillac's society, begins with the founder's decision to go to West Africa. Within six weeks after his arrival on the African Coast, Bishop Bresillac contracted yellow fever and died. However, the young society of African Missions under the capable leadership of Father Planque was not discouraged by the sudden death of the Bishop, but rather was determined to continue in the struggle to win Africa for Christ.

Four centuries of glorious failures and one century of rewarding success were crowned with the Kumansi Eucharistic Congress in February, 1951. On this occasion Our Holy Father, in his broadcast of February 24 to the Congress, praised the wonderful work that was being carried out in the Gold Coast of Africa.

In this book Father Bane has certainly produced a praiseworthy contribution to the History of Missions in West Africa. The fine index could have been further supplemented by a more detailed map of the mission territory. The many quotations from Papal documents show the paternal care of the Pontiffs for this missionary field. The heroic lives of the missionaries involved in this history set a definite pattern to be admired and, if possible, imitated by anyone who is filled with the spirit of Christianity.

JOHN MCGOLDRICK, O.S.F.S.

THIS MYSTERIOUS HUMAN NATURE. By James M. Gillis, C.S.P. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956. Pp. viii+244. $3.50.

This book is made up of a series of brief and magnificently practical essays, meant to serve and competent to serve as the foundations for meditations that should be most effective in furthering the reader's progress in the spiritual life and in intellectual perfection. The thirty-seven individual chapters are arranged under five general headings, "This Mysterious Human Nature," "St. Augustine and His *Confessions*," "God and No God," "Jesus Christ and His Church," and "Christianity: The Touchstone." The same brilliance of style and accuracy of content which marked the editorials of Father Gillis in *The Catholic World* from 1922 until 1948 are manifest in this, the latest of his books.

Older priests will want this volume because they will find in it the passion for truth and the intolerance of cant they have long known and admired in the writings of Father Gillis. Younger priests ought to read it so that they may experience, in the context of their own lives and on the vital issues of this time, the effects of what this reviewer and many of his contemporaries consider the greatest talent in the field of Catholic literature in our era.

Fashionable sham and entrenched error have never had a more deadly and effective enemy than the octogenarian author of *This Mysterious Human Nature*. Perhaps it was because his literary activity attained its peak in the twenties, the age of the "debunkers," that Father Gillis has been most outstanding as an exposer of false prophets and as a supremely competent confuter of the errors they have disseminated. At any rate his great gifts remain undiminished in this, the latest of his literary productions.

Father Gillis is perhaps the last, and certainly one of the last, of our writers to have achieved a definite and recognizable literary style. If you were to find a copy of *This Mysterious Human Nature* open on a library table, you could tell who had written it without bothering to look at the title page. In his case, the style most certainly is the man. His staunch and enlightened Catholicism shines through in every line. So, for that matter, does his "Bostonianism," a kind of amiable *préciosité* which must forever remain outside the range of competence and taste of every man born and nourished outside of Suffolk County in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Only one flaw, and that a rather common one, detracts from the excellence of *This Mysterious Human Nature*. In his chapter "Americanism in Theology," he has drawn far too pretty a picture of the movement which resulted in the issuance of Pope Leo XIII's *Testem benevolentiae*. There is ample evidence that the thing was much more and much worse, even in this country, than the utterly innocuous phenomenon he has described.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

THE GREAT PRAYER. By Hugh Ross Williamson. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956. Pp. 164. $3.25.

One of the greatest needs of our day is to make Catholics more aware of the Mass. We are suffering from a dangerous lack of knowledge of the meaning of the central act of Christian worship, the symbolic significance of the rubrics and the theological content of the prayers of the Mass. Hugh Ross Williamson has endeavored in this little volume to remedy some of this tragic ignorance. His concentration is on the Canon of the Mass. He has written an excellent introduction which includes a short description of the history of the sacerdotal vestments and their meaning. He then proceeds to give the translations of the individual prayers of the Canon of the Mass, followed by an analysis of their theological content, their history as far as it is known and their meaning. He has actually succeeded in incorporating a remarkable amount of theology and primitive ecclesiastical history into this short space.

Perhaps the most outstanding feature of the book is its apologetic approach. Beginning with the accepted historical age of the prayers of